The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXX, No. 3 MARCH, 1954

CONTENTS

Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice 145

The Apostolic Constitution *Exsul Familia*. Part II
Giuseppe Ferretto 146

Pope Pius XII and Pope St. Gregory the Great: Ecumenical Councils ..... *Alfred C. Rush, C.SS.R.* 163

The Our Father. Part I ..... *Thomas J. M. Burke, S.J.* 176

"Behold the Handmaid of the Lord"
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 183

Italy Is Not Going Communist ..... *Maurice S. Sheehy* 187

Magisterium and Jurisdiction in the Catholic Church
Joseph Clifford Fenton 194

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Walter J. Schmitz, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament 202

Funeral on the Feast of the Epiphany 202

Altar Frontal 203

Votive Masses 204

Reason for Bination 204

Blessing of Objects 205

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1954, by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

A Cunctis in a Votive Mass 205
Separation of Siamese Twins 205
The Granting of Quarantines in Indulgences 206
Auxiliary Bishop as a Confessor 207
A Problem on the Eucharistic Fast 207

BOOK REVIEWS

The Holy Trinity Book of Prayers, *compiled by Msgr. John K. Ryan* 209
Peter: Disciple—Apostle—Martyr, *by Oscar Cullman* 209
Teaching Religion, *by Joseph B. Collins, S.S.* 212
Christianity and the Problem of History, *by Roger L. Shinn* 213
The Breviary Explained, *by Pius Parsch* 214
Saint Paul: Apostle of Nations, *by Daniel-Rops* 216

It is FALSE ECONOMY to save inexpensive charcoal and waste costly incense!!

Use SELF-LITE Charcoal—it HOLDS and BURNS the three spoonsful of incense called for by rubrics.

★

See Your Dealer

BENWAY **KNEELING CUSHIONS**

Distinctive Products of Science and Skill

No Square Edges to Wear . . . No High Corners to Kick

Price and Recommendations on Request

Pat'd

Manufacturers of Kneeling Cushions Since 1939

BEN J. SMITH
MFG. & SUPPLY COMPANY
LINDBERGH BLVD., AT CONWAY RD.
ST. LOUIS 24, MISSOURI

PRO ECCLESIA ET PONTIFICE

His Excellency Monsignor Carlo Grano, Substitute Secretary of State to His Holiness Pope Pius XII, has notified the Very Reverend Monsignor Joseph C. Fenton, editor of the *Review,* that our Holy Father has graciously deigned to confer upon him and the *Review's* associate editors—the Reverend Fathers Thomas O. Martin, Edmond D. Benard, Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P., Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., and Alfred C. Rush, C.SS.R.—the Cross "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice," "in ricognoscimento della lodevole attività prestata nella direzione della Rivista 'The American Ecclesiastical Review.' "

It is with deep humility that the editor and associate editors of the *Review* express their gratitude to our Holy Father, realizing as they do that his kind recognition of the entire editorial board is an expression of his fatherly benevolence towards *The American Ecclesiastical Review* and The Catholic University of America, in whose work and mission they have been privileged in some small degree to participate.

Both the University and the *Review* by the very fact of their existence are dedicated to the service of our Divine Lord, the Way, the Truth, and the Life —a service which can be performed only in a spirit of complete loyalty to the Church that is His Mystical Body and the Pope who is His Vicar on earth. Relying on the maternal intercession of our Blessed Lady, the editor and associate editors of the *Review* dare to pray and to hope that "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice" will be always the description of their efforts and their goal.

THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION *EXSUL FAMILIA*

PART II

I

1. *Motive of the Constitution.* A brief little chapter, the third of Title One, explains the motive which gave rise to the Pontifical Document: the urgent need to provide with as little inadequacy as possible for spiritual assistance for the ever increasing number of refugees and of emigrants bound no longer only for certain regions of Europe and of America, but also for Australia and the Philippine Islands.

2. *Fundamental criterion.* It explains also the fundamental criterion which gives form to the new laws: "to instruct each local Ordinary with suitable norms, which are not in contrast with the laws of the Code of Canon Law, but correspond perfectly to their spirit and to custom; and to give him opportune faculties so that he can offer to foreigners, whether immigrants or transients, a spiritual assistance which is not unequal to their needs nor less than that which the rest of the faithful in his diocese enjoy."[1]

Consequently, the new legislation aims at establishing an organization of spiritual assistance for the emigrant, such as to guarantee to him who finds himself in a strange land, even if only temporarily (either for work or for reasons of study or because he is an exile or a refugee from his homeland), and without any intention of remaining there for long and much less forever, the same religious comforts which each of the faithful finds in his own country; and all this with forms which though new are not, however, in contrast with the canonical laws, but are in conformity with the spirit which dictated them and with custom.

In this, as we shall see, consists precisely the novelty of the *Exsul familia;* for the rest it was a matter of codifying, unifying,

[1] ". . . *unumquemque loci Ordinarium aptis instruere normis, a legibus Codicis Iuris Canonici non discrepantibus, sed eorundem menti atque consuetudini apprime respondentibus; eique opportunas dare facultates, ut alienigenis sive advenis sive peregrinis spiritualem posset praebere adsistentiam necessitatibus haud imparem nec minorem, qua ceteri fideles in sua dioecesi perfruuntur.*"

confirming, ameliorating (sometimes modifying, sometimes making more precise), extending pre-existing norms already tested by more or less limited use.

The novelty, quickly intuited by the maternal solicitude of the Church, imposed itself.

It was called for by the singular and insuppressible exigencies of the emigrant, who, while he feels in his heart a nostalgia for his homeland, being ignorant of the language and strange by reason of his customs, culture, and usages, his way of thinking and of expressing himself, cannot but feel himself a visitor, indeed a stranger, in the very church which he enters to pray.

It marks a great step forward, planted on the solid path already decisively traced out by the generous efforts of the heroic pioneers who had broken ground in this vast and precious field of the apostolate in a manner fully sufficient.

With this said by way of premise, and it was most important, we can easily enter into the matter of the second Title: Norms for handling the spiritual care of the emigrants.[2]

II

COMPETENCE OF THE SACRED CONSISTORIAL CONGREGATION

3. *The progress of the legislation and the need for a rearrangement.* It is known to all that the Motu proprio *Cum omnes catholicos,* wherewith Blessed Pius X, preoccupied with the spiritual needs of Catholics emigrating to foreign lands, established in the Sacred Consistorial Congregation a special Office or Section for the spiritual care of the emigrants, was issued prior to the promulgation of the Code of Canon Law, and precisely on Aug. 15, 1912.

Dec. 3, 1918, Pope Benedict XV, of happy memory, promulgated the famous Decree *Magni semper negotii* to regulate the migration of clerics to certain regions. Therein he derogated in part from the norms then existing, established in the Decree *Ethnographica studia* of March 25, 1914, and rules in conformity with the laws of the new Code of Canon Law were given.

In such pontifical documents on emigration, expressly excluded from the competence of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation

[2] *Normae pro spirituali emigrantium cura gerenda.*

were the faithful of Oriental Rite, whether lay persons[3] or clerics[4] who remained subject to the jurisdiction of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide first, of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, later.

It is well likewise to recall that with the Motu proprio *Sancta Dei Ecclesia* of March 25, 1938, Pope Pius XI of sainted memory, extended notably the competence of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, which obtained full and exclusive jurisdiction over certain regions even in Europe and not only over the faithful of the Oriental Rite, but also over the faithful of the Latin Rite dwelling in those regions, over their hierarchy, pious works, institutions, etc.

Furthermore, the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, upon which rests by reason of the aforesaid *Motu proprio* of Pius X the spiritual care of *all the faithful of the Latin Rite,* practically limited itself to moderating the transoceanic flow of emigration which had as its base of departure Italy and a few other Mediterranean nations, and as its point of arrival the Americas and the Philippine Islands. The Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide, on the other hand, had intervened directly to control the flow of clergy which, moving *"ex Europaeis dioecesibus"* in general, had for its terminus Australia and New Zealand.

Furthermore, the Sacred Consistorial Congregation had reserved to itself the application of the norms governing the emigration of Italian clergy while it had entrusted those regarding the clergy of Spain and of Portugal to the Pontifical Representatives stationed there.

Finally, according to the *Magni semper negotii,* the consent of the Ordinary *ad quem* was required for a stay of *more* than six months. In these latter years, however, as a result of the interest of the Bishops of the United States of America, such consent was required likewise for a minimum period whenever it was a case of going to a diocese in the United States.

[3] Cf. *Motu proprio, Cum omnes catholicos, ". . . salvo tamen iure S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide in emigrantes ritus Orientalis, quibus eadem Congregatio pro suo instituto opportune consulat."*

[4] Cf. Decree, *Magni semper negotii,* c. I, *"Integra lege Sacrarum Congregationum de Propaganda Fide et pro negotiis Orientalibus circa sacerdotum huius ritus migrationem."*

A good rule of government is uniformity. Wishing, therefore, to reduce thereto as far as possible the various norms already existing on the matter of emigration, the first task of the Legislator was that of determining competence. With this is concerned the first chapter which is entitled precisely: *De Competentia S. Congregationis Consistorialis in emigrantes.*

4. *Competence regarding emigrants in general.* The *first norm* refers to the *Motu proprio* of Pius X given Aug. 15, 1912: to take care of emigrants of the Latin Rite is the exclusive duty of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, whatever be the place of migration. Nevertheless, the Sacred Consistorial Congregation will proceed in accord with the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church or with that of Propaganda Fide if the place of migration is in territory subject to the one or the other of those Congregations.

With this determined, the Legislator extends somewhat the competence of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation when he declares that it is bound to perform the same duty toward the emigrants of the Oriental Rite, in accord, naturally, with the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, but only when it is a question of emigrants who transfer to territories which are not subject to that Sacred Congregation and who do not have the assistance of a priest of their Rite. It is the case, especially, of western ships which have on board a priest of the Latin Rite and which touch ports of the Near East where groups of Oriental emigrants embark bound, e.g., for one of the Republics of Latin America.

5. *Competence regarding priests emigrating from Europe.* The *second norm* regards priests of the Latin Rite when they themselves are emigrants. The sole congregation competent is the Consistorial, even if those priests of the Latin Rite are subject to the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church (e.g., those who pertain to the Eparchy of *Piana dei Greci*) or to the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide (Sweden, Norway, etc.) and are not bound for territories depending upon those Sacred Congregations. Indeed, says the law, Oriental priests themselves who emigrate to territories not subject to the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church must conform themselves also to the laws by which are bound the Latin priests who emigrate. Consequently, e.g., they

must first of all have the consent of the Bishop *ad quem*. They will not be able to devote themselves to the spiritual assistance of a group of their fellow-countrymen of the Latin Rite who are emigrating (it is the case of a priest of the diocese of Lungro who would like to assist his fellow-Calabrians of the Latin Rite) without having in advance the permission of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation.

6. It establishes, therefore, that all priests emigrating from Europe and from the Mediterranean shores and bound overseas, no matter, therefore, for what continent, for whatsoever duration of time, and, consequently, even for the purpose of incardination, must have in advance, under penalty of incurring the canonical penalties threatened in the *Magni semper negotii,* the permission of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, which exercises this function either directly (as, in fact, occurs for Italians and for the refugees from the countries beyond the Curtain) or through the Pontifical Representatives whom it provides with suitable faculties, each for the priests pertaining to the dioceses of the nation to which he is accredited.

From this law Religious are not exempted, unless, having permission from their respective Superiors, they go to houses of their own Institute; and much less when it is a case of those who are exclaustrated or secularized.

7. The consent of the Bishop *ad quem* is always and in every case required for every permission. If, therefore, this is obtained for one diocese it is not valid for another. Hence it is necessary to make a new recourse to the authority which granted the first permission. Even in this case, however, as long as the norms of common law are observed and, except *in casu necessitatis,* the limits of time established in the first Rescript are not exceeded, the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, in order that the observance of the law shall not become in such case too burdensome, is wont to provide with suitable faculties the Pontifical Representatives in the regions overseas.

The prolongation of the permission, pertains, normally, to the one who made the first concession.

8. *Competence regarding the establishment of national parishes and of "missions with care of souls" for the emigrants.* From the first norm follows another determination of competence: there is,

indeed, no better way to assure the spiritual welfare of the faithful than to entrust their care permanently to a pastor. The Constitution, in Art. 4, establishes, therefore, that it pertains to the Sacred Consistorial Congregation to grant the apostolic indult, according to the rule of Canon 216, §4, of the Code of Canon Law: "that parishes in accordance with the diversity of language or of nationality may be established *for the convenience of emigrants.*"[5]

9. It likewise pertains to the Sacred Consistorial Congregation to grant to the Ordinaries the permission to establish a personal mission *cum cura animarum pro diversitate sermonis seu nationis.*[6]

10. *Competence regarding the priests who dedicate themselves to the spiritual assistance of the emigrants.* It follows, too, that to the Sacred Consistorial Congregation and to it alone, it pertains to provide for the spiritual care of the emigrant by means of a clergy which is specialized and authorized for this by the same Sacred Congregation, i.e. by means of the Migrants' Missionaries and the Chaplains on Board.[7]

This is, then, the law for assistance to the emigrés of every nationality, which must, therefore, be applied, as in fact has occurred, e.g., even to the Chinese of Latin Rite currently refugees in the Philippines. The *Magni semper negotii* required the direct intervention of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation only for Italian priests who intended to dedicate themselves to the assistance of their fellow-countrymen and principally to the farmers and the workers even in Europe itself *"aut in itinere transmarino."*

III

NEW ORGANIZATION OF SPIRITUAL ASSISTANCE TO THE EMIGRANTS

11. It is now time to examine particularly how spiritual assistance to the emigrant is organized by the *Exsul familia.*

This organization, at the top of which is the Sacred Consistorial Congregation with the Delegate for Emigration, is most simple but at the same time sufficient and complete. It is characterized by the fact that, while from the beginning and up to a certain stage of the development it proceeds in immediate dependence upon

[5] ". . . *ut paroeciae pro diversitate sermonis seu nationis* in commodum emigrantium *constitui possint.*"

[6] Cf. Art. 34.

[7] Cf. Art. 5.

the Holy See, thereafter, while remaining under its vigilant eye, it goes on harmoniously inserting itself into the diocesan arrangement and ends by coming under the complete jurisdiction of the Bishop. The august Legislator did not want, in fact, to substitute himself for the authority of the Bishops, but rather to give to the Bishops new faculties, with the consequent secure advantage of an easy adaptability to the circumstances, of a greater stability, and of a more certain success.

The chief elements of this organization are:

(1) The Supreme Council on Emigration;

(2) The National Directors, each one Secretary of the National Episcopal Commission;

(3) The Directors of the Missionaries and the Directors of the Chaplains on Board. Every national group of Missionaries (Italian, Polish, German, etc.) can have its own Director;

(4) The Migrants' Missionaries, with or without care of souls, and the Chaplains on Board.

Let us pass briefly in review each of the aforesaid categories.

12. *Concerning the Migrants' Missionaries and the Chaplains on Board in general.* This is a body of priest-volunteers, whether they are bound by special vows to a Religious Institute [Missionaries of St. Charles, or Scalabrinians (for the Italians); Society of the Holy Angels (for the Germans); *Societas Christi pro emigrantibus* (for the Poles)] or are diocesan priests who place themselves at the disposition of the Holy See for the apostolate among the emigrants or among those who travel by sea.

They are selected by the Sacred Consistorial Congregation and prepared, so far as possible, under the care of the same Sacred Congregation. For the Italians there is the Pontifical College of Priests for Emigration, which is entrusted to the Scalabrinian Missionaries and which has its seat in the historic palace of St. Apollinaris. The sixth chapter of the second Title of the Constitution treats thereof exclusively. Approved and appointed by a special document of the Sacred Congregation for a period of time determined in the Rescript itself, they receive their assignment directly from the same Sacred Congregation.

To these two categories are to be added the *Chaplains of the Apostleship of the Sea,* who take care of seafaring personnel

whether during the voyage or while the ships are tied up in the ports, where the sailors are received in the houses known as *Stella Maris.*

13. *Concerning the Migrants' Missionaries in particular.* Their appointment is communicated officially to the Ordinary *a quo* and to the Ordinary *ad quem.*

It is most interesting to see what effects this appointment produces, examining it first of all in regard to the juridical relationships between the priest who is invested therewith—whether he be secular or religious—and his own Ordinary, and then in the juridical relationships between the priest and the Ordinary of the place where the Missionary exercises or will exercise his office.

The terms of the Constitution are unequivocally clear. The Consistorial Rescript does not derogate in any way from the common norms of law which regulate the relationships between every cleric and his own Ordinary or Religious Superior as well as between the cleric and the Ordinary of the place. "It does not produce excardination and grants no exemption either from one's own Ordinary or Religious Superior or from the Ordinary of the place in which the Missionary happens to be."[8]

The same is true for the Chaplains on Board and the Directors, whether of Missionaries or of Chaplains.

The appointment as a Missionary does, however, give something special to the priest; and this consists in the official mandate of the Holy See to exercise the sacred ministry among the emigrants. With this the Missionary is granted, before the Bishops of the world, wherever he will be sent, the capacity to receive the necessary faculties.[9]

What are these faculties? *Per se,* they are all the faculties of the ministry of which the Bishop can dispose according to common law.

The *Exsul familia,* however, goes much farther. The Constitution authorizes and recommends along with the use of such authorization that each Ordinary grant to the Missionary the power to exercise in favor of his emigrants the *cura animarum.*

[8] Cf. Art. 18, § 2, ". . . *excardinationem non parit nullamque dat exemptionem sive a proprio Ordinario aut a Superiore regulari sive ab Ordinario loci in quo missionarium versari contingat.*"

[9] Cf. Art. 33.

14. *The Establishment of the "Personal Mission with care of souls" for the migrants.* To avoid misunderstanding, we must remember that art. 34 of the Constitution, to which reference has previously been made, deals only with that *extraordinary* spiritual assistance about which the Holy Father spoke in his discourse of Aug. 7, 1952, to the missionaries for Italian migrants in Europe. The *Osservatore Romano* reported these words of the Sovereign Pontiff to the missionaries. "Make the migrants understand that yours is an *extraordinary* spiritual assistance, which must give them, among other things, an opportunity to go to confession in their mother tongue when it is not possible to do so to priests of the locality, but that, nevertheless, they must make it a point to attend divine services on feast days together with the Catholic organizations, especially of workers and of youth."

To this form of *extraordinary* assistance, with which the fourth chapter of the Constitution's second "title" is entirely concerned, one is to have recourse, as the document says in art. 32, only "whenever the application *(recursus)* to obtain an indult for the erection of a parish according to the diversity of language or of nationality will appear to be inexpedient."

National parishes are ruled by the common law. Thus the membership in these parishes is not limited in the way that attachment to a "Mission with care of souls" is restricted, as is described in the first sentence of section 15b of this article. Art. 32 of the Constitution praises these national parishes and at least indirectly recommends them to the Ordinaries.

When the founding of a national parish is impossible, the Constitution provides for the establishment of a "Mission with care of souls." This remains an extraordinary remedy, and, of itself, it justifies a certain limitation, for that matter quite comprehensive, imposed by the Legislator, in view of the common welfare, in the very act of granting this new and easier form of spiritual assistance. The limitation will be treated later in this article, in section 15b.

To sum this matter up, one can say that the intention of the Legislator is that, where migration has become stable, the Most Excellent Ordinaries are to provide for adequate assistance to the faithful who are descendants of immigrants through the establish-

ment of "national parishes"; but where this condition of stability has not been reached, provision is to be made, in urgent cases, by the establishment of "Missions with care of souls."

Before he does this, however, the Ordinary, in line with what Canon 216, §4, prescribes on the subject of national parishes, must in each case have recourse to the Sacred Consistorial Congregation[10] for the purpose of obtaining its approbation for the establishment of a "Personal Mission with care of souls in accordance with diversity of speech or of nationality."

15. *Characteristics of the "mission with care of souls."* Such a mission has its own characteristics which are imposed, as a necessary consequence, by the peculiar circumstances in which the ministry among the emigrants must be exercised, especially if they are seasonal workers (suffice it to think of the encampments of the miners).

(a) For the establishment of the mission even the slightest material plant is not required; not even a chapel of their own. In this case the Bishop will provide with suitable norms that the missionary-pastor may be enabled *plene et libere* to exercise his ministry in some church of the locality, *paroeciali non excepta.*[11]

(b) Only emigrants, even though naturalized, and their descendants in the first degree of the direct line will compose the personal mission, and, consequently, will be subjects of the missionary pastor.[12] Art. 40 speaks of all the "alienigenae," consequently all the members of a family of *migrants,* including the ascending and descending members of the line, without distinction of degree, benefit and will benefit by the law, as long as they are in the condition of *advenae* and of *peregrini ad normam juris communis.* Not only they will benefit, but also their descendants *in primo gradu lineae rectae,* even though they are no longer either *advenae* or *peregrini* and notwithstanding the fact that they have already obtained the *jura nationalitatis.* Thus, for example, Titius and Caia, Poles, migrate to France, together with their elderly parents, Sempronius and Cunegunda, and their children, Siegfried and Elizabeth. All of these people are in the condition of migrants, and all benefit from the law, from the elderly Sempronius and Cunegunda to the very young Siegfried and Elizabeth. Any chil-

[10] Cf. Art. 34, ". . . *audita Sacra Congregatione Consistoriali.*"
[11] Cf. Art. 37.
[12] Cf. Art. 40.

dren born to any of these people will likewise benefit, even though they may be born after the parents have already established themselves and have become naturalized in France. In the matter of the interpretation of the words *"advena"* and *"peregrinus,"* with reference to the effect with which we are concerned; it is obvious that they must be understood in the widest sense since we are dealing with a *lex favorabilis.*

(c) The aforesaid subjects, however, always remain free to choose between the missionary-pastor and the local pastor.[13] From this derives the sage norm that the missionary, on whom is placed the express obligation to keep the parochial books mentioned in Canon 470 of the Code of Canon Law, is to send, at the end of the year, a copy thereof to the local pastor and another to the Director of the missionaries.

(d) The missionary-pastor, in the exercise of his functions, is made equal to a true and proper pastor.

In particular: With regard to the administration of Confirmation. The Migrants' Missionaries, to whom is entrusted by the local Ordinary the spiritual care of the migrants, can administer the Sacrament of Confirmation to their subjects who are *in articulo mortis,* according to the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, *Spiritus Sancti munera,* of Sept. 14, 1946.[14]

With regard to assistance at marriages: (a) The Migrants' Missionary who has care of souls, *"servatis ceteris de iure servandis,"* assists validly at marriages within the confines of the territory assigned to him, when one or the other of the contracting parties is his subject.

(b) As regards liceity, the Missionary must abide by the dispositions of Canon 1097, § 2, of the Code of Canon Law which prescribes that in every case it is to be the rule that the marriage is to be contracted in the presence of the bride's pastor, unless a just cause excuses.[15]

(c) For the ascertaining of the status of the contracting parties the Missionary must follow the special norms given by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments in the *Instructio: De normis a*

[13] Cf. Art. 39.

[14] *AAS,* XXXVIII:349.

[15] *"In quolibet casu pro regula habeatur ut matrimonium coram sponsae parocho celebretur, nisi iusta causa excuset . . ."*

parocho servandis in peragendis . . . of June 29, 1941. Particularly must he keep in mind nn. 4 and 10.[16]

(d) The power which the missionary-pastor possesses is personal and is cumulative with that of the pastor of the territory.[17]

16. *Concerning the Chaplains on Board in particular.* Evidently all that has been said with regard to the "Missionary" cannot be applied to the "Chaplain on Board."

The faculties which the latter has in the exercise of his functions can be thus summed up:

(a) Those which common law accords to priests *iter maritimum arripientes;*

(b) Those necessary for the exercise, limited though it be, of the care of souls. It is the province of Chaplains for those journeying by sea to exercise the care of souls, during the voyage, except for matters matrimonial;[18]

(c) Those other faculties which, contained in a special *Index,* the Sacred Consistorial Congregation is accustomed to grant;[19]

(d) Those which belong to the rector of a church, *"si in navi oratorium legitime exstet."*[20]

The Chaplain on Board, too, is bound to keep the books of persons baptized, of those confirmed and of the dead, and at the end of every voyage he must give an extract therefrom to the Director.[21]

With regard to the custody of the aforesaid books and the obligation to send authentic exemplars thereof to the Curia, the Sacred Consistorial Congregation has established the following:

(1) An authentic copy of the books of those baptized, of those confirmed and of the dead, compiled by the Chaplains on Board, must be transmitted to the Curia of the diocese where the office of the Director is situated.

(2) It pertains solely to the Director to transmit to the Curia the books handed over to him by the Chaplains on Board.

[16] *AAS,* XXXIII:297-307. For all the matter treated in n. 15(d), cf. *AAS,* XLV, 758.

[17] Cf. Art. 36.

[18] Cf. Art. 25, § 1, *"Proprium est cappellanorum navigantium itinere maritimo perdurante curam animarum gerere, excepta re matrimoniali."*

[19] *Ibid.,* § 2.

[20] Cf. Art. 26.

[21] Cf. Art. 25, § 3.

(3) The prescriptions of the sacred canons being faithfully observed in this matter, the pastor of the faithful who may be involved is to inform himself solicitously with regard to the acts inscribed in the aforesaid books.

17. Finally, to the Ordinary of the diocese to whose territory belongs the port where the ship is habitually based belongs the right to bless and to establish the oratory of the ship.[22]

18. *The Directors of the "Missionaries" and of the "Chaplains."* Chapter III (Art. 18-23) treats amply also of the Directors whether of Migrants' Missionaries or of Chaplains on Board. The Directors do not have jurisdiction either territorial or personal.[23] Nevertheless, it is the main duty of the Director to deal with the Bishops, to present the Missionaries to them, etc.

It is likewise a function of the Director to direct, to watch over, to convoke, to assist the Missionaries, and to make a report concerning them, at the end of the year, to the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, together with that concerning the condition of the missions.

In other words, the *munus* of the Director can be said to be analogous to that of a Vicar Forane.

IV

CONCERNING THE PARTICIPATION OF THE BISHOPS IN THE SPIRITUAL CARE OF THE EMIGRANTS

19. The Legislator has chosen likewise to give to the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, a certain articulation in the very vast and complex task of the direction of spiritual assistance to the emigrants. At the same time he has not wanted this Sacred Congregation to bear the grave responsibility exclusively, all by itself, and for this reason he has given it an opportunity to benefit from the participation, even though indirect, of the hierarchy of the various nations.

From these premises are derived:

20. *The National Directors.* Each National Director superintends, by mandate of the Bishops, the activities in behalf of the emigrants. These, for countries having only immigration, are

[22] Cf. Art. 30.

[23] Cf. Art. 19.

indicated in chapter IV and to them also there is reference, in a general way, in Art. 49, § 1, part one. For the countries of emigration, like Italy, they are set forth in chapter V.

Evidently in the countries which are at the same time of immigration and of emigration, at least internal, i.e. within the borders of the country, the two activities come under the supervision of the National Director, unless the Bishops prefer to entrust them to two separate Directors.

21. *The Supreme Council on Emigration.* It, too, is set up in the Sacred Consistorial Congregation. Into this are taken, first of all,[24] the National Directors of the activities regarding migration who, where they exist, are the Secretaries of the Episcopal Commissions for spiritual assistance to migrants which the Constitution approves and encourages.[25]

22. *The International General Secretariate of the Apostleship of the Sea.* Similar to the Supreme Council on Emigration is the International General Secretariate of the Apostleship of the Sea, an activity of which the Sacred Congregation has the supreme direction since May 30, 1942.

Members of the Secretariate are first of all the National Directors named by the Bishops.

V

CONCERNING THE DELEGATE *AD OPERA DE EMIGRATIONE*

22. To the institution of the Delegate *"ad opera de emigratione"* are dedicated several articles of the Constitution and particularly chapter II. He is, as it were, a *"longa manus"* of the Sacred Congregation in promoting the spiritual welfare of the emigrants and in the direction of the Missionaries, of the Chaplains on Board, and of their respective Directors. It is the particular function of the Delegate to look after and encourage, by all means which seem best suited, the welfare, especially spiritual, of the faithful who emigrate whatever their language, race, or nationality, and, *servatis servandis,* their Rite, discussing the matter, if the case requires it, either with Our Secretariate of State or with civil authorities and institutions.

[24] Cf. Art. 7, § 3, 1°.

[25] Cf. Art. 6, § 1.

To this end the Delegate, in the name and at the direction of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, shall by his efforts and advice encourage and assist all Catholic associations, institutions and undertakings whether international or national, and likewise —saving the rights of the Ordinaries—diocesan and parochial, which intend to reach the same goal.[26]

The Delegate, therefore, presides over the Migrants' Missionaries and over the Chaplains of those making sea voyages, as well as over their respective Directors. He directs them, supervises them, and, if the necessity occurs, he must report concerning them to the Sacred Congregation.

With regard to such priests, it is the duty of the Delegate to seek them from among those who desire to dedicate themselves to the spiritual care either of the emigrants or of the passengers on ships, especially transoceanic, or of the so-called seafaring personnel, i.e. of those who are attached to the vessels, whether tourist or merchant, and constitute their complement. This last task is quite particularly that of the "Chaplains of the Apostleship of the Sea."

Such priests he presents to the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, to which it pertains to approve them (after a suitable period of preparation, which for the Italians is provided at the Pontifical College of Priests for Italian Emigration), and to appoint them with a special Rescript and, finally, to give them their destination. The Delegate then takes steps so that the missionaries and the new chaplains may reach their mission or their ship, and he will not cease to lend them the assistance necessary for the purposes of their special ministry.

At the end of each year the Delegate sends a complete report of the spiritual and material condition of the missions to the

[26] Cf. Art. 1, § 2, 2°, *"Proprium Delegati est curare et fovere, iis omnibus auxiliis quae aptiora videantur, bonum, praesertim spirituale, fidelium emigrantium cuiusvis sermonis, stirpis, nationis, ac, servatis servandis, ritus; initis ad hoc, si casus ferat, rationibus sive cum Nostra Secretaria Status, sive cum civilibus magistratibus et institutionibus.*

Hunc in finem Delegatus, nomine et de mandato Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis, opera et consilio favebit et adsistet omnibus consociationibus, institutionibus et operibus catholicis, sive internationalibus sive nationalibus, necnon—salvo iure Ordinariorum—diocesanis et paroecialibus, quae idem prosequi intendant."

Sacred Consistorial Congregation, while during the course of the year he keeps the local Ordinaries and the National Directors apprised of the emigrants about to arrive.

The success and the growth of the "World Emigrants' Day" is entrusted by the *Exsul familia* in very special manner to the Delegate for Emigration.

He is also General Secretary of the Supreme Council on Emigration and of the International General Secretariate of the *Apostolatus Maris.*

Since the Delegate has been established, in consequence the offices, whether of Prelate for Italian Emigration, or of Visitors or Delegates for the various languages and nations have ceased to exist.[27]

VI

NORMS FOR THE BISHOPS OF ITALY

24. The fifth chapter is entitled: *De spirituali adsistentia ab Episcopis Italiae praestanda emigrantibus.* It gives a résumé of the duties of each Ordinary and of each pastor involved. It recommends the establishment of diocesan and parochial *committees* and *protectorates.* It likewise recommends the preparation, especially catechetical, of the emigrant and the continuation of the assistance even in the places of migration. It also recommends the distribution of the "ecclesiastical ticket," the celebration of Emigrants' Day with the collection of offerings, and the application, on the part of the pastors, of one Holy Mass a year according to the intentions of the Sovereign Pontiff.

25. We might ask ourselves why, in a collection of general norms, there have been inserted norms regarding Italy alone. Even the last chapter, the sixth, treats of a particular point, i.e. of the *Pontificio Collegio dei Sacerdoti per l'Emigrazione italiana.*

The answer, however, is simple if one considers the content of Art. 49 and above all of Art. 56, which is the last one. The Legislator treating expressly of Italian emigration has desired to offer norms, already tried, to the Ordinaries of the other nations who might find themselves in the necessity of taking care, in their

[27] Cf. Art. 17.

turn, of spiritual assistance for their own people who emigrate. In the other, says the text, places or nations outside of Italy which are involved in emigration, where perhaps suitable spiritual assistance for Catholics emigrating from that nation is not provided, the Ordinaries will undoubtedly be able usefully to provide therefor if, in keeping with the particular circumstances of places and situations, they will carefully follow the method outlined for Italian emigrants.[28]

VIII

THE WORLD EMIGRANTS' DAY

26. A clear proof of the foregoing we have also from Art. 49, with regard to the "Emigrants' Day."

Therein the Legislator, though treating of Italians, turns no longer to the Bishops of Italy, but to the Bishops of places where Italians have migrated. He congratulates these Bishops on the national and diocesan activities undertaken in behalf of the immigrants and especially on the committees, and asks the same Bishops, *"ab iis expetimus,"* that in the Italian parishes or at least where the Italian population is in the majority, there be celebrated the annual "Emigrants' Day," as is prescribed for Italy.

Then, he goes farther. The same can be done, continues the Legislator, for the emigrants of other nationalities, and he concludes: "So that at the same time, namely on the first Sunday of Advent, an Emigrants' Day can be observed in the whole Catholic world."[29]

GIUSEPPE FERRETTO
Assessor of the
Consistorial Congregation

Rome, Italy

[28] Cf. Art. 56, *"In ceteris emigrationis extra Italiam locis seu nationibus, ubi conveniens forte desit emigrantibus catholicis illius nationis spiritualis adsistentia, utiliter procul dubio consulere valebunt Ordinarii si, pro peculiaribus locorum rerumque adiunctis, relatam pro Italis demigrantibus agendi rationem, sollicite inibunt."*

[29] Cf. Art. 49, § 2, *". . . ita ut uno eodemque tempore, nempe Dominica prima Adventus, dies pro emigrantibus in toto catholico Orbe celebrari queat."*

POPE PIUS XII AND POPE ST. GREGORY THE GREAT: ECUMENICAL COUNCILS

It is both fitting and timely to write an article on Pope Pius XII and Pope Saint Gregory the Great that appears in print in March, 1954. On March 12, 1939, Pope Pius XII was crowned Pope;[1] then the present gloriously reigning Pontiff began a pontificate which, no doubt, in the annals of papal history will be described as glorious. On March 12, 604, St. Gregory ended his pontificate as the Vicar of Christ and departed unto Him, whose vicar he was;[2] on that day there ended the pontificate of one on whom history has aptly conferred the title, "Great."[3]

Furthermore, March, 1954, represents the fiftieth year since Pope Blessed Pius X published his celebrated encyclical on St. Gregory to commemorate the thirteenth hundred anniversary of his renowned predecessor in the Papacy.[4] In that early year of the twentieth century it was a pleasure for Blessed Pius X to recall the memory of St. Gregory and to point out the importance of his work, spirit, and teaching not only for the sixth century but also for the twentieth. To him, Gregory was a "great and incomparable person," and also his "most holy and illustrious predecessor, the glory and ornament of the Church." Pope Pius X mentions that, by reason of his doctrine and the richness of his virtues, Gregory left an imprint on the Church that was so vast, so profound, and so durable that, with good reason, his contemporaries and the succeeding ages bestowed upon him the title, "Great." He then goes on to say that in these modern times one so honored still deserves the tribute inscribed on his tomb: "By his innumerable good works he lives always and everywhere."[5]

[1] *Coronatio Summi Pontificis, AAS,* XXXI (1939), 125-29. On p. 129 there is added a *curriculum vitae* of the Pope, giving the outstanding dates from his birth to his coronation.

[2] John the Deacon, *Vita S. Gregorii,* IV, 68 (*MPL,* LXXV, 221A); F. Dudden, *Gregory the Great. His Place in History and Thought,* I (London, 1905), 268.

[3] P. Lehmann, "Mittelalterliche Beinamen und Ehrentitel," in *Erforschung des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1941), pp. 134-36.

[4] Pius X, *Iucunda sane, ASS,* XXXVI (1903-04), 513-29.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 514.

This quality of belonging to all times and places explains why St. Gregory was great in the past and is great in the present. He is great to the present Holy Father who has so many links with him and who has had recourse to his writings so frequently. Here we would like to single out the thought of these two Pontiffs on the work and the importance of Ecumenical Councils and on the necessity of adhering wholeheartedly to the truths which they define.

In the annals of the history of the Church, Ecumenical Councils play a most decisive role. In them faith is defended, illustrated and defined; they show forth the teaching of the Church, that society established and governed by Christ to preserve His teaching intact; in definitions of faith they are infallible.[6] The high regard in which Ecumenical Councils are held is seen in the encyclicals which the Popes write in connection with special centenary commemorations of these Councils. The year 1951 marked the fifteenth centenary of the Council of Chalcedon, a council which, even among Ecumenical Councils, is of outstanding significance.[7] To commemorate this Council, Pope Pius XII issued the encyclical, *Sempiternus Rex,* and he called attention to two particular points, namely, the primacy of the Roman Pontiff which was clearly acknowledged at Chalcedon, and the special importance of the Council of Chalcedon with regard to dogmatic definitions.[8]

In connection with the importance of Ecumenical Councils in general, and of the Council of Chalcedon in particular, Pope Pius XII quotes a celebrated passage from St. Gregory. After pointing out how Pope Pius XI commemorated the Council of Nice in 1925,[9] and the Council of Ephesus in 1931,[10] he goes on to say:

> In this letter We wish to commemorate with special reverence and care the Council of Chalcedon, for the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon are indissolubly linked together from the fact that both treat of the hypostatic union of the Incarnate Word. From the earliest times

---

[6] H. Dieckmann, S.J., *De ecclesia,* II (Frei. i. Brei., 1925), 77-89; J. Forget, "Conciles," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* III (1938), 664-67.

[7] F. Murphy, C.SS.R., *Peter Speaks through Leo. The Council of Chalcedon* (Washington, D. C., 1951).

[8] Pius XII, *Sempiternus Rex, AAS,* XLIII (1951), 626.

[9] *AAS,* XVII (1925), 124, 187, 223-26, 505, 595, 634-36.

[10] Pius XI, *Lux Veritatis, AAS,* XXIII (1931), 494-517.

both were held in the greatest honor, not only in the Eastern Church which commemorates them in its liturgy, but also in the Western Church, as St. Gregory the Great himself attested when, praising them equally with the two Ecumenical Councils held in the previous century, those namely of Nice and Constantinople, he uttered this statement that is worthy of mention: Upon these, as upon a four-cornered stone, the structure of the holy faith rises, and everyone who does not hold fast to their solid teaching, whatever be his life or manner of living, even if he seems to be a stone, lies nevertheless outside the building.[11]

These words of St. Gregory are taken from his synodical letter which he sent to the other Patriarchs on becoming Pope. On the election of a Pope it was the custom to send a synodical letter to the other Patriarchs; similarly, when a Patriarch was elected in the other Sees (Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem) he sent a synodical letter to the Pope and the other Patriarchs. As a rule, the synodical letter was a form letter, containing a profession of faith; it was a guarantee of orthodoxy. Thus, if the profession of faith on the part of a Patriarch was not orthodox and satisfactory, the Pope and the other Patriarchs would not enter into communion with him until this matter was righted.[12]

Gregory's synodical letter was unique in the sense that, before presenting the profession of faith, he wrote a rather long tract on the ideals of priestliness, a theme that was very dear to his heart. This theme is developed at greater length and with greater detail in his celebrated work, *Pastoral Care*.[13] The synodical letter is an excellent résumé of this longer work of St. Gregory.[14] In this he tries to animate the other Patriarchs with his own exalted ideals of priestliness in the hope that there will be a Christlike program of government in the East as well as in the West. This résumé of priestly ideals addressed to the Patriarchs is very similar to

[11] Pius XII, *Sempiternus Rex*, *AAS*, XLIII, 626.

[12] J. Eidenschink, O.S.B., *The Election of Bishops in the Letters of Gregory the Great* (Washington, D. C., 1945), p. 64; P. Batiffol, *Saint Grégoire le Grand* (Paris, 1928), p. 184.

[13] Gregory the Great, *Regulae pastoralis liber* (*MPL*, LXXVII, 13-128); H. Davis, S.J., *Gregory the Great. Pastoral Care* (Ancient Christian Writers, XI [Westminster, Md., 1950]).

[14] Gregory the Great, *Registrum Epistolarum*, I, 24 (*Monumenta Germaniae historica, Epistolae*, I, 28-37).

that which he later gave to the Bishops gathered in the Lateran baptistery.[15] Incidentally, this writing was particularly praised by Blessed Pius X who urged the bishops to read it frequently and to see that it was read to their priests during the time of their annual retreat.[16]

It was only after Gregory had given this preliminary instruction on the priesthood that he comes to the matter of the profession of faith, in which there is such a pronounced emphasis on the Ecumenical Councils. In this connection he states:

> Furthermore, *because with the heart we believe unto justice, but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation,*[17] I acknowledge that I receive and revere the four Councils just as I do the four books of the Holy Gospel, namely, the Council of Nice in which the wicked teaching of Arius was destroyed; the Council of Constantinople in which the error of Eunomius and Macedonius was refuted; the first Council of Ephesus in which the impious teaching of Nestorius was judged; and the Council of Chalcedon in which the wicked teaching of Eutyches and Dioscorus was condemned. I embrace them with my entire devotion and guard them with my entire approbation, because upon these, as upon a four-cornered stone, the structure of the holy faith rises, and everyone who does not hold fast to their solid teaching, whatever be his life or manner of living, even if he seems to be a stone, lies nevertheless outside the building."[18]

Such is the statement of Gregory in which Ecumenical Councils receive such prominent attention. This statement has been a source of embarrassment for many, and G. Lau undertook to clear Gregory from the reproach that he put conciliar definitions and the statements of the Scripture on an equal footing. Lau maintained that, for Gregory, Scripture alone was the source of knowledge and the norm of Christian doctrine.[19] F. Dudden, on the other hand, admits that Gregory recognizes two sources of revelation, namely, Scripture and Tradition. He maintains, however, that

[15] Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Evangelia,* I, 17 (*MPL,* LXXVI, 1138-49).

[16] Pius X, *Iucunda sane, ASS,* XXXVI, 527.

[17] *Rom.* 10:10.

[18] Gregory the Great, *Reg. Ep.*, I, 24 (*MGH, Ep.*, I, 36).

[19] G. Lau, *Gregor der Grosse nach seinem Leben und seiner Lehre* (Leipzig, 1845), pp. 329, 541.

Gregory did not regard them as two independent authorities of equal value and importance. Of Gregory, he says: "Rather, he seems to look upon Scripture as the final and supreme authority, of which Tradition was the handmaid rather than the rival. . . . Tradition remains a supplement which is of value only in so far as it gives accurate expression to Scriptural truth. The ultimate appeal is to Scripture itself."[20]

Despite such statements by non-Catholic biographers of St. Gregory, his own statement still stands. Besides Scripture, the written letter, Gregory recognized a living magisterium as a source of instruction in sacred truth. This is brought out when he accentuates such passages of Scripture as: "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding the profane novelties of words,"[21] or "Hold the traditions which you have learned."[22] This living magisterium is a teacher and a witness to the truth or revelation given by God. This revelation can be given in written form or handed down, *viva voce,* e.g. the truth that Mary had no children but Jesus. The latter form after being handed down *viva voce* can and did find its way into the writings of the Fathers and liturgical documents and was, when the opportunity demanded it, solemnly defined by the Church.[23]

Gregory shows that Scripture is not the only norm for sacred doctrine when he treats of heretics,[24] both in their relation to Scripture and the writings of the Fathers. Heresy, obviously, can arise from going counter to the teaching of the inspired books, and Gregory brings this out clearly when he remarks that oftentimes heretics, while striving to bolster up their wicked errors, bring forth statements that are assuredly not contained in the pages

[20] F. Dudden, *Gregory the Great,* II, 299.

[21] *I Tim.* 6:20.

[22] *II Thess.* 2:15.

[23] F. Dudden (*loc. cit.*) admits that Gregory looks to the Fathers and Councils as indisputable authorities in matters of faith. Then, by a curious process of reasoning he says that, for Gregory, the ultimate appeal is always to Scripture. The Church elaborates the doctrine of the Apostles, but its doctrine is derived entirely from the Apostles. Dudden, obviously, completely identifies the doctrine of the Apostles with Scripture, a position which Scripture itself does not warrant.

[24] A. Boros, *Doctrina de haereticis ad mentem S. Gregorii Magni* (Rome, 1935).

of the sacred books.[25] It is at this juncture that he quotes the passages from Scripture about keeping the traditions and the things that have been committed to our trust. With this as his foundation, he goes on to state: "Heretics, in longing to be praised for their apparently excellent knowledge, bring forth, as it were, new teachings which are not contained in the old books of the ancient Fathers. Thus it happens that, while they strive to appear learned, they scatter seeds of foolish doctrine on their wretched hearers."[26] The same idea is stressed when he describes the wicked who come to a better frame of mind and who hunger to receive the message of Scripture. In this process they betake themselves to the writings of the Fathers, and as often as they ponder over this teaching their souls are edified. Their good beginnings, however, are nullified by the works of the heretics who, by their pernicious persuasions, destroy in their minds the teaching of the Fathers.[27]

The approved teaching of the Fathers, then, is something that must be adhered to in the interpretation and exposition of Sacred Scripture. Holding to the teaching of the Fathers is a guarantee of orthodoxy; conversely, to reject the approved teaching of the Fathers is to run into heresy.[28] These are indications that, in Gregory's mind, Sacred Scripture was not the only source of sacred truth. There was also sacred truth embodied in the Fathers insofar as they conserve the teaching of the official Church, insofar as they derive their doctrine from the Church, and are considered as particularly authoritative witnesses of the deposit of faith.[29]

After pointing out the importance of the Fathers, Gregory passes on to explain the importance of the Ecumenical Councils

[25] Gregory the Great, *Moralium libri, sive expositio in librum Job*, XVIII, 26, 39 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 58B).

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] *Moralia*, XVI, 53, 66 (*MPL*, LXXV, 1152C). Cf. also *Homiliae in Ezechielem*, I, 7, 15; I, 10, 38 (*MPL*, LXXVI, 847, 901).

[28] L. Weber, *Grundfragen der Moraltheologie Gregors des Grossen* (Frei. i. Brei., 1947), pp. 51-53. Father Weber gives a good presentation of Gregory's stand on the relation of Scripture and Tradition. He concentrates mainly on Gregory's statements about the Fathers. A more adequate treatment necessitates a study of Gregory's teaching about the Ecumenical Councils. Hence, their treatment in this paper.

[29] E. Amann, "Pères de l'église," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, XII (1933), 1199; H. Dieckmann, *De ecclesia*, II, 187-90.

in the matter of faith and revealed truth. He is extremely articulate on this point, and rightly so, for in the Councils we have the preaching of the Church itself, we have the magisterium officially stating how it understands, proposes, and defines its own God-given revelation, either given in the sacred writings or handed down *viva voce*. In examining that section of the passage of St. Gregory in which he assigns reasons for his statements, the passage which Pius XII singled out as worthy of mention, we will juxtapose statements by Pius XII in which the same matters are handled.

St. Gregory states that he venerates the Ecumenical Councils because it is upon these that the structure of holy faith rises. In the question of faith there is the element of condemning what is heretical and the element of stating the truth positively. Both Popes speak of the condemnation of heresy in almost identical words. St. Gregory affirms: "I acknowledge that I receive and revere . . . the Council of Chalcedon in which the wicked teaching of Eutyches and Dioscorus was condemned." Pope Pius XII refers to this as follows: "But now we must come to the cardinal point of the whole issue, namely, the solemn definition of Catholic faith, whereby the pernicious error of Eutyches was repudiated and condemned."[30]

With regard to the positive aspect of presenting the true doctrine, Gregory remarks, as noted, that upon the Ecumenical Councils the structure of the holy faith rises. Pope Pius XII, speaking of Peter's confession of Christ as the Son of the living God, notes that this faith has been effectively defended and clearly illustrated by the three Ecumenical Councils of Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.[31] Of Chalcedon in particular, he writes: "There, under the leadership of the Apostolic See, by a vast assembly of Eastern Bishops, the doctrine of the unity of Christ, in the one Person of whom the two natures, human and divine, unite, while remaining distinct and separate, was vigilantly defended and wonderfully proclaimed after it had been adulterated by an impious and daring attack."[32]

[30] Pius XII, *Sempiternus Rex*, *AAS*, XLIII, 632.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 625.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 640.

The work of the Ecumenical Councils, upon which the structure of the holy faith rises, is not a work of adding to faith and revealed doctrine. It is a case of the magisterium of the Church officially and infallibly teaching how it interprets, proclaims, and defines the truths of revelation of which it is the custodian. It sets the stamp of infallibility on a truth, declaring that this truth has been revealed by God and is to be believed as such. It may be, as in the case of Chalcedon, a truth that is contained in Sacred Scripture, in the inspired writings. This is why Pope St. Leo the Great, the outstanding champion of orthodoxy at the time of Chalcedon, says that whatever we have written is proved to be taken from the doctrine of the Apostles and Evangelists.[33] This is why Pope Pius XII repeats the same thought and declares that the sublime doctrine, defended at Chalcedon, is derived from the Gospels.[34] The doctrine which was derived from the Gospels was, at the same time, the teaching of the Church. It was the teaching of the Church from earliest times, professed in written documents, sermons, and liturgical prayers.[35]

This doctrine, then, was the property of the Church; it formed part of the *praedicatio ecclesiastica*. When it was attacked, the Church proclaimed officially, solemnly, and infallibly the doctrine which was hers and given to her in God's revelation. If an Ecumenical Council defines a doctrine that is contained in Scripture, we must bear in mind that Scripture is the Church's book. "She received it and she owns it; in fact she wrote it. Only she can tell us what is Scripture and what is not; only she can tell us authoritatively what it means; only she has the divine right to quote Scripture and say: This is what you must believe."[36] It is, therefore, literally true that upon the Ecumenical Councils the structure of the holy faith rises, for in them we have an infallible guide to what God has revealed.

[33] Leo the Great, *Epistula*, 152 (*MPL*, LIV, 1123A).

[34] Pius XII, *Sempiternus Rex*, *AAS*, XLIII, 635.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 638.

[36] W. Burghardt, S.J., "The Catholic Concept of Tradition in the Light of Modern Theological Thought," in *The Catholic Theological Society of America. Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Convention* (New York, 1951), p. 68.

The second point St. Gregory makes regarding Ecumenical Councils is concerned with the doctrine that they propose and the faith which they define. He emphasizes the universal obligation of holding fast to their solid teaching. Pope Pius XII likewise insists on holding to the definition of Chalcedon just as it is. Thus he says: "Let all who bear the name of Catholic find therein a strong motive to cultivate the faith, the pearl of great price mentioned in the Gospel, professing and preserving that faith unimpaired, and above all giving testimony to it by their lives."[37] In a similar manner, he states: "Let no one allured by the fallacy of a human philosophy and deceived by the ambiguities of human language either shake by doubt or pervert by harmful innovation the dogma ratified at Chalcedon."[38]

Not only must the definition of a Council be held just as it is, but care must be taken not to go beyond its defined limits. Indication of this possible danger was seen in the foregoing quotation. The Holy Father, however, gives a stern warning against tampering with the doctrine of Chalcedon and he also specifies how this can take place. Thus, he says: "This same doctrine let those ponder more deeply and truly who, moved by an excessive desire for novelties, dare to extend somewhat the limits that have been religiously and inviolably established, in their investigation of the mystery whereby we have been redeemed."[39] Exceeding the limits of the definition of Chalcedon can take place with reference to the divinity of Christ. Here the Holy Father goes on to speak of an error that is current outside Catholic circles and which is concerned with a false interpretation of these words of St. Paul: "Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who though he was by nature God, did not consider being equal to God a thing to be clung to, but emptied himself, taking the nature of a slave and being made like unto men."[40] By falsely interpreting this text, some teach that in Christ there is a limitation of the Divinity of the Word. The Pope denounces this teaching as an opinion that is strongly opposed to the Chalcedon profession of faith, as something that is to be reprobated because it reduces the

[37] Pius XII, *Sempiternus Rex, AAS,* XLIII, 627.
[38] *Ibid.,* p. 643.
[39] *Ibid.,* p. 627.
[40] *Phil.* 2: 5-7.

entire mystery of the Incarnation and Redemption to lifeless and empty shadows.[41]

On the other hand the limits of the defined doctrine of Chalcedon can be overstepped in treating the humanity of Christ, as can be readily seen from these words: "Although there is nothing against making a more profound investigation of the humanity of Christ, even from the psychological aspect and viewpoint, nevertheless there are some who, in difficult studies of this kind, stray too far from the ancient teachings so that they build up new theories and wrongly have recourse to the authority and definition of Chalcedon to bolster up the theories they have devised."[42] The Pope here is speaking of those who exalt the humanity of Christ in such a way that it seems to be a subject that is *sui iuris,* and that it seems as though it does not subsist in the person of the Word Himself. While this is a warning to hold fast to the definition of Chalcedon in general, it was particularly timely and devised to meet an actual condition in Catholic scholarship. These tendencies were present in a work by Father Seiller, *La psychologie humaine du Christ et l'unicité de personne,* a work that was condemned and placed on the Index on June 27, 1951.[43] While it is unfortunate that the author of this work should have gone so far, it is a joy to record that on July 12, 1951, he humbly submitted to this decree of the Holy Office.[44]

After speaking of the necessity of holding fast to the solid teaching of the Ecumenical Councils, Pope St. Gregory the Great explains what takes place when one does not do this. Such a person, whatever be his life or manner of living, even if he seems to be a stone, lies outside the building. The entire imagery is taken from these words of St. Peter: "Unto whom [Christ] coming, as to a living stone, rejected indeed by men, but chosen and made honorable by God; be you also as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ."[45] Combining this

[41] Pius XII, *Sempiternus Rex, AAS,* XLIII, 637.

[42] *Ibid.,* p. 638.

[43] *Suprema Sacra Congregatio S. Officii, Decretum, AAS,* XLIII, 561.

[44] *Suprema Sacra Congregatio S. Officii, Submissionis notificatio, AAS,* XLIII, 602.

[45] *I Peter* 2: 4-6.

text with the words, "Jerusalem which is built as a city,"[46] Gregory says: "This is the city, that is, the holy Church which will one day reign in heaven and which now labors on earth. To the citizens of this city, Peter says: 'Be you also as living stones built up.' "[47] One is a living stone when he is joined to Christ, the foundation, by professing the faith as defined by the Ecumenical Councils. To reject this teaching means that one is outside the building, that he is not a living stone in the building, even though he may seem to be a stone. To reject this teaching means that one is in heresy, that he is excluded from the Church and cut off from Catholic unity.

Pope Pius XII is equally as emphatic on this point when he speaks of those who reject the primacy of the Roman Pontiff and the dogmatic definition of Chalcedon.

> Let those who because of the wickedness of the times, especially in Eastern lands, are cut off from the bosom and unity of the Church not delay to follow the teaching and example of their forefathers and to reverence with due homage the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. Also, let those who are entangled in the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches penetrate to the mystery of Christ with the purer eyes of the mind and accept, at last, in its completeness this teaching [the dogmatic definition of Chalcedon].[48]

These words show that those who rejected Chalcedon are cut off from the Church. While Pius XII states this as a fact, he is principally concerned with making fatherly pleas for the return of those who are all the more dear because they have been absent for so long.[49] He reminds them that the greatest glory of God and good of mankind shines forth when the complete truth and perfect charity of Christ unite the sheep together. Then he asks them to consider if it is right and expedient for them to remain separated from the one holy Church that is built on the Prophets and Apostles and on the chief cornerstone, Jesus Christ.[50] Deploring the unfortunate situation whereby many in Eastern lands are cut

[46] *Psalms* 121 : 3.

[47] Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Ezechielem,* I, 1, 15 (*MPL,* LXXVI, 938D). St. Gregory delighted in commenting on these words of St. Peter whom he calls the first teacher in the Church.

[48] Pius XII, *Sempiternus Rex, AAS,* XLIII, 626 f.

[49] *Ibid.,* p. 643.

[50] *Ibid.,* p. 637.

off from the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ for long centuries, he then asks them if it is not holy and salutary and in accordance with the will of God that all, at last, make their return to the one fold of Christ.[51]

In the mind of St. Gregory the Great, the refusal to accept the definition of Ecumenical Councils meant exclusion from the Church; it meant that one was no longer a living stone in the building of the Church. The teaching of Pope Pius XII on exclusion from the Church is obviously the same as that of St. Gregory, but his comparisons and imagery are different. Those who reject the definition of a Council are separated from the Church, cut off from the bosom and unity of the Church, cut off from the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ; they are separated from the Apostolic See; they are separated from the one holy Church, founded on the chief cornerstone, Jesus Christ; they are the sheep whose return he awaits to the one fold.

When Pope Pius XII issued this encyclical, he could have given his teaching without any reference to Pope Gregory the Great. It would have been every bit as sound, orthodox and valid. However, in their writings the Popes delight in looking back and bringing forth apposite statements from their predecessors. Pope Pius singled out this passage of St. Gregory and described it as a passage that was worthy of mention. It summed up succinctly his own teaching. There is a vital link connecting Gregory and Pius, namely, the Papacy; there is also a vital link uniting these two and that is Catholic doctrine. And the doctrine which they propose, like Christ Himself whose place they take, is the same yesterday, today, and forever.

On this, the fifteenth anniversary of the Holy Father, may St. Gregory obtain for him many blessings in his burdensome office of Vicar of Christ. In the spirit of Christ who came not to be ministered unto but to minister, Gregory delighted in calling himself the Servant of the Servants of God. For him to preside over the Apostolic See and to serve the Apostolic See were synonymous terms.[52] In his mind those in authority should glory not in ruling

[51] *Ibid.*, pp. 640 f.

[52] Gregory the Great, *Reg. Ep.*, I, 26; VI, 12 (*MGH, Ep.*, I, 40, 391). These are merely samples taken at random of Gregory's frequent practice of

over others but in coming to the service of others.[53] May he obtain continuation of this spirit in Pope Pius XII, for him who also says that to rule the Apostolic See is to be at the service of the Apostolic See.[54] And in serving the Apostolic See may he be blessed in serving the cause of Catholic truth.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

---

interchanging the words *praeesse* and *servire* when speaking of his role in the Apostolic See.

[53] Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis,* II, 6 (*MPL,* LXVII, 34C). This is the antithesis between *praeesse* and *prodesse* which figures so prominently in his works.

[54] Pius XII, *Sempiternus Rex, AAS,* XLIII, 641. Here the Pope speaks of the Apostolic See, *cui praeesse est prodesse.*

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH

The hand of God is visible in the very origin of this institution. The work began in an obscure and feeble way, as indeed is the wont of every great institution. A cry of distress from the West, uttered by Bishop Dubourg, of New Orleans, in 1815, and a similar appeal in 1816, from Asia, falling on the ears of two pious women in the great city of Lyons, France, Miss Jaricot and the widow Petit, inspired the design whence originated the Association. The Society began among the women factory-hands of the city, each member agreeing to contribute one cent a week out of her scanty wages. A few hundred dollars were thus gathered the first year and sent to Louisiana and to the Asiatic missions. Thus our young Church was one of the earliest beneficiaries. Soon the Association received the sanction of ecclesiastical authority and spread rapidly through Europe.

—The Rev. Dr. Edward McSweeny of Mount Saint Mary's in the article "America and the Propagation of the Faith," *AER,* XX, 3 (March, 1899), 229.

THE OUR FATHER

Part I

"Quotidianum penicillum" is one of the titles which Augustine gives to the Our Father.[1] This appellation has a strange ring for modern listeners, so accustomed to the use of penicillin to check all types of infection in the body. One sees immediately an analogy—which Augustine would have welcomed—to the power of correct prayer in checking spiritual infection. The Latin word means a small brush. It was this simple metaphor which Augustine intended: the Our Father brushes imperfections off the soul. (The modern drug has been given its name because of the brush-like appearance of the mold from which it is developed.) Augustine also calls the Our Father "medela quotidiana contra peccata levia" (a daily safeguard against venial sin),[2] "a daily medicine,"[3] "our cleansing,"[4] "a sort of daily baptism as it were."[5]

Since it is the only prayer which Our Lord taught to his followers it is evident that it must hold a place of eminence among all forms of prayer. Suarez states that all the Fathers have noted that the Our Father holds the first place in dignity and excellence among the diverse forms of prayer because of the eminence of its author and because the whole matter of prayer is here contained in a very brief but marvellously ordered and arranged prayer.[6]

Bonaventure says of it: "This prayer is outstanding in three ways; in dignity because it was composed by Christ, in brevity so that it is more quickly learned, more easily retained and more frequently said, in richness because it contains all requests and embraces what is necessary for this life and eternity."[7]

Is there then a positive obligation of knowing and reciting it? Against those who say there is and quote Durandus and the *Concil. Toletan.* and *Concil. Remens.* and some of the writing of Augustine, Suarez shows that there is no ecclesiastical precept in this matter for the faithful. But he does say—stressing in particular

[1] Augustine, *Opera omnia* (ed. Caillau, Paris, 1842), XIX, 548.
[2] *Ibid.*, II, 363.
[3] *Ibid.*, XVII, 31.
[4] *Ibid.*, XXXIV, 225.
[5] *Ibid.*, XX, 119.
[6] Suarez, *Opera omnia* (ed. Berton, Paris, 1859), XIV, Lib. 3, c. 8, n. 2.
[7] Bonaventure, *Opera omnia* (ed. Peltier, Paris, 1871), X, 207.

the obligation of teachers and parents—that Christians may have a moral obligation of knowing and reciting it.

Morally speaking, Christians are able to have [an obligation] from the very fact that they are Christians. This obligation arises not so much from positive precept of the Church, as from the very nature of being a Christian. Since the faithful are obliged to pray, as we have shown above, it is necessary that they know and understand for what they are able to pray and how they should pray. And since prayer can be necessary from the very beginning of the use of reason, it is necessary that they should learn even from childhood how they should pray. They cannot learn this more quickly or more conveniently than from the Lord's Prayer, and thus morally speaking both parents and pastors are held to teach this to their children or their flocks by reason of their office. And the faithful are obliged to learn this prayer in some fashion, at least to the extent necessary for them to pray in a fitting manner, even though they are not obliged by rigorous precept to memorize and remember it word for word.[8]

Maldonatus writes thus:

Neither did Christ wish that every time we pray we should ask for everything this prayer asks for, but that we should ask for either everything, or some things, or at least for nothing contrary to the things this prayer asks for. Christ Himself prayed for those who were crucifying Him, a request not included in the Lord's Prayer, but consonant with one of its petitions—that the name of God be hallowed even in the salvation of His enemies.[9]

St. Augustine in his letter to the rich widow, Proba, says that all correct prayers are reducible to the petitions of the Our Father. St. Thomas develops this notion of Augustine and analyzes the prayer to show that it is the most perfect prayer because in it are requested all the things which are rightly to be desired and in the order in which they are to be desired.[10] Augustine says that the first three petitions pertain to eternity in which they will have their completion and that all three shall remain for eternity, and the last four pertain to the present life.[11] In one of his sermons on the Lord's Prayer Augustine repeats the idea thus: "For always should

[8] Suarez, *loc. cit.*, c. 6, n. 8.
[9] Maldonatus, *Commentarium in quatuor evangelistas* (Paris, 1621), 142b.
[10] *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 83, a. 9. [11] Augustine, *Opera*, XIV, 233-35.

we sanctify the name of God, always should we be in his kingdom, always should we do his will. This will be for eternity. . . . The other requests which we make pertain to the necessities of this life."[12]

The prayer is divided into an "exordium" as Bonaventure calls it, a "preamble" in the phrase of Suarez, or, as Augustine more exactly terms it, a small preface *(praefatiuncula)* and the seven petitions. The preamble elevates the mind to God, according to Suarez, through faith, love and trust. We shall now treat the small preface, and then the seven petitions.

PREFACE

Pater

Thomas in his exposition of this word treats first of the reasons for saying "Father" and then of the duty incumbent upon us towards Him who is our Father. *Pater* is the correct word by reason of our special creation, because He has created us in His image and likeness which had not been given to lesser creatures. Thomas quotes *Deut.* 32:6: "Ipse est pater tuus, qui fecit et creavit te." Likewise "Father" is used because "although He governs others, He governs us as lords *(dominos)*, others as slaves *(servos)*."[13] The third reason for saying "Father" is our adoption: "Because to other creatures he has given small gifts but to us an inheritance; and this because we are sons; but: 'If sons, also heirs' (*Gal.* 4:7); and *Rom.* 8:15: 'The spirit you have now received is not, as of old, a spirit of slavery, to govern you by fear; it is the spirit of adoption, which makes us cry out, Abba, Father.' "[14] Because we can truly say "Father" we owe Him, according to Thomas, honor (*Mal.* 1:6: "Si ego pater, ubi est honor meus?"), imitation (*Jer.* 3:19: "Patrem vocabis me, et post me ingredi non cessabis," and *Matt.* 5:48: "But you are to be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect"), obedience and subjection (*Heb.* 12:9: "We have known what it was to accept correction from earthly fathers, and with reverence; shall we not submit, far more willingly, to the Father of a world of spirits, and draw life from him?").

[12] *Ibid.*, XVIII, 190.
[13] St. Thomas, *Sermones et opuscula* (ed. Raulx, Paris, 1881), 116.
[14] *Ibid.*, 117.

Suarez notes that though the name "Father" "probably can be directed to the first Person of the Trinity in so far as about him it is ordinarily used by appropriation; nevertheless it is much more probable for it to be taken here as a common name for the whole Trinity."[15] This is a view in which Maldonatus concurs, writing: "I prefer the opinion of the others who say that here the whole Trinity is called Father by us. For why do we call God Father? First, because He created, but not only the Father but the whole Trinity created us. Second, because God conserves; but not only the Father but the whole Trinity conserves. Third, because He redeemed; but not only the Father but the whole Trinity redeemed us, the whole Trinity by acting, the Son alone by suffering. And thus in regard to the redemption indeed the Son alone, rather than the Father alone, should be called Father by us. Fourth, because through grace God regenerated us, but the whole Trinity regenerated us."[16] This opinion appears to be shared by many authors as Suarez shows.

Augustine and Bonaventure stress the trust which the term Father should excite in us. "Remember that you have a Father in heaven. Remember that you who were born from your father Adam for death, should be reborn from God your father for life. When you pray these things pray them in your heart. Let there be affection in the one praying, and there will be an effect in the one hearing."[17] (This sentence shows the difficulty of translating much of Augustine without losing his neatness and balance of phrase, his play on words. In Latin the sentence is: "Sit orantis affectus, et erit exaudientis effectus.")

Noster

If our Father is the father of all then we are all brothers, as Augustine notes.[18] Suarez says that in the "Our" are included "all men in this life, for we should pray for all, as is stated in I Tim. 2, and the requests of this prayer extend to all men, as we shall see; and God is the saviour of all, although especially of the faithful."[19] Maldonatus appears to emphasize just the faithful under

[15] Suarez, *loc. cit.*, c. 8, n. 3.
[16] Maldonatus, *op. cit.*, 143c.
[17] Augustine, *Opera*, XVIII, 178; cf. *ibid.*, 191-92, and Bonaventure, *Opera*, X, 207.
[18] Augustine, *Opera*, XVIII, 202.
[19] Suarez, *loc. cit.*, c. 8, n. 5.

the term "Our," saying: "When we pray to God, we pray as one member of the Church. Who prays otherwise, is able perhaps to pray *(orare)*, but is not able certainly to pray effectively *(exorare)*."[20] Bonaventure agrees with Suarez in taking "Noster" to include all men.[21]

We say "Pater Noster" but Christ says "Pater mi." Christ is the son of God in a special manner, being generated by the Father, while we are sons by creation and adoption: "He in a special way, we in a common way; which the Lord himself wishes to teach when he said in John, 20: 'I go to my Father and to your Father.'"[22] Maldonatus in similar vein says: "He is the Father of all in the same way because He created all, conserves all, nourishes all, and also redeemed all in so far as it was his task. But in that way in which He is the Father of Christ He is the Father of no other. For He is the Father of Christ not because He created Him but because He begot Him from His own substance."[23]

Our prayer should proceed from a universal charity, because when we pray, "Our Father," we confess that all are our brothers as Christ taught in *Matt.* 23:9: "You have but one Master, and you are all brethren alike. Nor are you to call any man on earth your father; you have but one Father, and he is in heaven." Our prayer should not be for ourselves only but for all men and for the whole Church. Augustine admonishes the rich and the great of their duty of love towards the poor and the lowly, saying: "Christians have not been constituted to lord it over the poor and the lowly; because all alike call to God, 'Our Father,' which they cannot do truthfully and faithfully, unless they recognize that they are brothers."[24] Thomas finds in "Our" a double duty of love and reverence towards others.[25] In support he quotes *I John*, 4:20: "If a man boasts of loving God, while he hates his own brother, he is a liar. He has seen his brother, and has no love for him; what love can he have for the God he has never seen?"; *Mal.* 11:10: "Nonne unus est pater omnium nostrum?"; and *Rom.* 12:10: "Be affectionate towards each other, as the love of brothers demands, eager to give one another precedence."

[20] Maldonatus, *op. cit.*, 143d.
[21] Bonaventure, *Opera*, X, 207.
[22] Suarez, *loc. cit.*, c. 8, n. 4.
[23] Maldonatus, *op. cit.*, 143d.
[24] Augustine, *Opera*, XIV, 218.
[25] St. Thomas, *Sermones* . . . , 118.

Qui es in coelis

Maldonatus says: "Here is certainly meant the dwelling place of God who, although he is everywhere, is said to dwell in heaven, because there His glory most specially shines forth, because 'in sole posuit tabernaculum suum' (*Psalm* 18:6)."[26] Suarez in like manner says that "Who art in heaven" was added not because God is not everywhere but because in heaven His majesty is shown in a singular way. "And so He has designated that place as a sort of kingly curia and has placed His throne there. . . . Secondly, He speaks of God existing in heaven, that our mind in prayer may be lifted from earthly things. . . . Perhaps from this came the ancient custom among Christians when they prayed of looking up towards the heavens, arms spread out and head bare, as Tertullian describes it in Apol. c. 30. Finally I add the interpretation of some of the Fathers who taught that heaven was a metaphor for the just soul in which God dwelt as in heaven. . . . Although this teaching is to be admitted, it should not supplant the literal meaning which it indeed supposes. It is useful for a man when praying to learn to seek God within himself . . . and to respect that temple of God also."[27]

Bonaventure interprets "in heaven" to mean in the angels or in the saints. He concludes his short exposition by saying: "We say then, 'Our Father who art in heaven,' that is in the spiritual world, that we may learn to hasten towards the spiritual gentleness in which He dwells, and to ask of Him heavenly things."[28] Augustine is strenuous in defending his position that "in coelis" means "in sanctis et justis": "If in heaven is taken to mean that God dwells as it were in the higher parts of the world, then the birds have the greater merit for they live closer to God. It was not written however that God is close to men who live in high places or to those who live on mountains; but it was written that 'God is close to patient hearts' (*Psalm* 33:19), which relates much more to humility. . . . 'It is a holy thing, this temple of God which is nothing other than yourselves' (*I Cor.* 3:17). If then God dwells in His temple and the holy are His temple, then 'who art in heaven' rightly means 'who art in the holy.' . . . God is said to be

[26] Maldonatus, *op. cit.*, 144c.
[27] Suarez, *loc. cit.*, c. 8, n. 6.
[28] Bonaventure, *Opera*, X, 207.

in the hearts of the just as in His holy temple."[29] When a man prays and truly wishes that God should dwell within him, then he achieves justice, and God is enticed to enter into his soul.

St. Thomas combines both views in his measured exposition.

> The phrase, "in heaven," can be related to three things. First to the preparation of the man praying, so that "in heaven" is referred to heavenly glory (for in the phrase of Matthew, your reward is great in heaven). . . . Secondly the phrase, "who art in heaven," can relate to the ease with which God hears us, because He is close to us; so that "who art in heaven" is interpreted as "who art in the holy," for in them God dwells, according to *Jer.* 14:9: "Tu in nobis es, Domine." . . . Thirdly the phrase, "who art in heaven," can pertain to the efficiency of the one who listens to our prayer. Thus by heavens we understand the material heavens, although God cannot be contained by the corporeal heavens: "Coelum et coeli coelorum te capere non possunt" (*III Reg.* 8:27); in order to emphasize the penetrating gaze of God who sees as it were from on high, "Prospexit de excelso sancto suo" (*Psalm* 101:20). And also we signify the sublime power of God: "The Lord has set up His throne in heaven, rules with universal sway. Bless the Lord, all you angels of His; angels of sovereign strength, that carry out His commandment, attentive to the word He utters; bless the Lord, all you hosts of His, the servants that perform His will; bless the Lord, all you creatures of His, in every corner of His dominion; and thou, my soul, bless the Lord (*Psalm* 102:19-22). . . . And so although God is not bound by material places . . . nevertheless He is said to be in the material heavens in order to insinuate two things, the sweep of His power and the sublimity of His nature.[30]

(To be continued)

THOMAS J. M. BURKE, S.J.

New York, N. Y.

[29] Augustine, *Opera,* XIV, 218-19.
[30] St. Thomas, *Sermones . . .*, 119-21.

"BEHOLD THE HANDMAID OF THE LORD"

The Annunciation, March 25, is one of the greatest feasts of the Church year and one of the oldest. It dates from the seventh century, at least, and perhaps even from the fifth.[1] Actually, it is a feast of Our Lord as well as a feast of His Mother, because on this day we commemorate the virginal conception of the Son of God in the womb of Mary. Indeed, in old calendars this festival was sometimes called *Festum Incarnationis, Initium Redemptionis* and *Conceptio Christi.*[2] But it is now firmly established as a feast of the Blessed Virgin in the ecclesiastical cycle.

The main reason for regarding the Annunciation as primarily a feast of Mary rather than of the Word Incarnate is probably the fact that the description of the angel's visit and message, contained in the Gospel of St. Luke,[3] does not state that the Incarnation actually took place on this occasion. In fact, this point was the subject of some discussion on the part of theologians in former centuries.

Suarez proposes the question: "Whether the Blessed Virgin at the time of the annunciation conceived Christ at once?" He answers that it is held as certain by Catholics that the conception of the Word took place before the angel departed from Mary. He goes on to say that according to many of the Fathers the conception occurred either simultaneously with the words of the angel: "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee" or even prior to those words. Suarez himself, however, proposes as a certain doctrine that the Word did not assume human nature until Mary gave her consent to accept the office of the Redeemer's mother: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it done to me according to thy word."[4] He argues very well from the text: "His name was called Jesus, the name given him by the angel *before* he was conceived in the womb."[5] The name "Jesus" was announced by the angel some time after he had saluted her; so evidently the conception did not take place before or concomitantly with the salutation.

[1] Cf. Holweck, "Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary," *Catholic Encyclopedia,* I, 542.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Luke* 1:26-38.
[4] *Luke* 1:38.
[5] *Luke* 2:21.

Suarez tries to reconcile the Fathers in question with the view which he himself upholds by explaining that they meant that the Incarnation took place during the colloquy of the angel with Our Lady. "They speak of the entire colloquy as of one moment." The precise moment of the conception, according to Suarez, was that which immediately followed the sublime words of Mary: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord." It is true, the internal consent of Mary must have preceded the external expression of consent; nevertheless, it was fitting that the conception should take place only after Mary had manifested her willingness to be the mother of the Redeemer, since the invitation came to her externally through the angel's message.[6]

Undoubtedly, the views of Suarez represent the traditional belief of the Church concerning the day and even the precise moment of the Incarnation. We find corroboration in the exact nine-month period between the feast of the Annunciation and Christmas, and also in the approved formula of the *Angelus,* which asserts "and the Word was made flesh" immediately after the repetition of Mary's expression of conformity to God's decree. Liturgy, too, supports this belief, for the Collect in the Mass of the Annunciation is directed to God the Father "who didst will that *at the message of an angel* (*angelo nuntiante*) the Word should take flesh from the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary."

It is also a traditional belief that the Almighty determined to await Mary's consent before effecting the hypostatic union, the intimate union between the Person of the Word and the human nature made up of the body provided by Mary and the soul created by divine power. It is true, the angel's words in themselves seem to indicate an absolute divine decree: "Thou shalt conceive . . . The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee." But these words must be taken in connection with Mary's final response: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it done to me according to thy word." No coercion was to be applied by God; the outcome was to be Mary's own choice. Beyond doubt she realized that the acceptance of the exalted office proffered to her would involve excruciating suffering. She was aware that the Messias was to be a

[6] Suarez, *Comm. in summam,* III, q. 30; disp. IX, sect. 4. *Opera omnia* (Paris, 1860), XIX, 142-43.

man of sorrows; perhaps, too, with the infused knowledge granted to her she had a more detailed prevision of the share that would be incumbent on the Redeemer's mother than we have today of the lot which fell to the Mother of sorrows. Yet, in her great charity she was willing to accept the office because thus the salvation of the world would begin to be realized. In the words of Roschini: "She most generously accepts the most dolorous mission offered to her in order that the human race may be saved, and pronounces her 'Fiat,' thus opening the door to the Incarnation of the Word of God, from which our objective redemption, so to say, takes its beginning."[7]

In one of his famous October Encyclicals, Pope Leo XIII proposed this doctrine in this poetic manner: "The eternal Son of God, when He wished to take human nature for the redemption and glory of man, and in that way was about to enter on a kind of mystic wedlock with the human race, did not do so until the most free consent of the chosen Mary had been given."[8]

It is the fact that Mary gave free consent to the function of the divine maternity that constitutes the basis of her participation in man's redemption and entitles her to be designated the Coredemptress of the human race. Her co-operation toward the Incarnation and its consequence, the redemption, did not consist basically in the divine maternity as a merely physical function. It arose from her free and conscious acceptance of the office of mother of the Saviour. It was a divine vocation, voluntarily undertaken. Even if she had not accepted the task, it would seem that she would not have committed any sin.[9] Her acceptance, then, was a most sublime act of charity toward mankind, and most meritorious on her part. St. Bernardine of Siena wrote: "The Blessed Virgin, by her consent to the conception of the Son of God merited more than all creatures, whether angels or men, in all their acts, desires and thoughts."[10]

[7] Roschini, *Compendium Mariologiae* (Rome, 1946), p. 243.

[8] Leo XIII, Encyl. *Octobre Mense; Acta Leonis XIII,* V, 10.

[9] Some theologians, however, would dispute this because they regard positive imperfections as sinful. In any event, however, it would seem that a refusal on the part of Mary would not have been a sin of disobedience.

[10] St. Bernardine of Siena, *De Immac. Concept.,* Sermo 4, art. 3, cap. 1.

It does not follow necessarily that if Mary had not given her consent the Incarnation of the Son of God and the Redemption would not have taken place in some other way—perhaps through the consent of some other chosen woman. Moreover, it should not be objected that Mary had already received supernatural gifts precisely because she was to be the Mother of God, especially the Immaculate Conception. We have here an example of the mysterious workings of divine prevision and the freedom of the human will. From all eternity God knew that Mary would accept the office; yet, He still allowed her freedom of choice. Thus, she freely became the mother of God, and by a corollary the spiritual mother of all mankind.

While it is commonly admitted that the "Fiat" of Mary constituted a true co-operation toward our salvation, there is a discussion among theologians whether this co-operation is to be regarded as proximate or remote toward man's salvation. Those who champion the doctrine of Mary's office as Co-redemptress (always subordinate to the redemptive activity of her Son) are inclined to favor the former opinion.[11] However, as far as Catholic teaching is concerned either opinion can be accepted.

Pope Pius XII has glorified the feast of the Annunciation in this Marian Year by designating this day as one on which Catholics can gain an indulgence, applicable to the souls in purgatory, each time (*toties quoties*) they visit a church dedicated to Our Lady, under the conditions of confession and Holy Communion and prayer for the Holy Father (six Our Fathers, Hail Marys and Glorias). Most appropriately, therefore, on this great feast will priests and people take advantage of this extraordinary spiritual privilege, with their hearts filled with gratitude toward her who took so important a part in our salvation by her generous words of consent to God's plan: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it done to me according to thy word."

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[11] Cf. Roschini, *op. cit.*, pp. 243 ff.

ITALY IS NOT GOING COMMUNIST

Italy today is a free and democratic state which is playing an important role in the community of western nations in their common effort to build a united front against Soviet aggression.

Since 1947, when ex-Premier Alcide De Gasperi boldly ejected the Communists from participation in the government, the Christian Democrat-led government has been firmly anti-Communist.

The Italian people has supported the unification of Europe and NATO; the Government is committed to passage of the European army plan under EDC; and although Italy is not a member of the UN (Russia has vetoed her admission five times) it equipped, staffed and sent to Korea for service a complete hospital unit, which was a similar contribution to that of Sweden, a prominent UN nation.

Internally Italy is faced with pressing political, social, and economic problems, as well as the largest local Communist Party outside the Soviet orbit (estimated today to be something over 1.5 million active members). However, in spite of these pressures, aggravated by Communist propaganda, the Government has permitted the stationing of considerable bodies of NATO Troops, largely American, in Naples, Florence and Leghorn. This position is maintained despite Communist efforts to enflame Italian nationalism against "this imperialistic invasion."

Furthermore, Italian internal security against an armed coup and treasonous subversion is better organized and prepared today than at any time since the close of the war. Constant police effort has been rewarded by confiscation of important Communist caches of arms and ammunition without which para-military activity would be severely restricted. The files of the police bulge with information on Commie leaders, their techniques and plans. What is more important to the visitor to Italy is the efficient manner in which the Ministry of the Interior, with its famed, tough and spectacular anti-Communist "Celere"—jeep-riding, helmeted riot police—handle Commie outbursts. There is no coddling and there is no record of successful Communist violence against these representatives of the government.

The defense picture is also encouraging. The military forces, after complete demoralization under Fascism, have been rebuilt into an organization possessing *esprit de corps,* and led by staunch anti-Communist officers strongly committed to the West. Italy has contributed its quota of troops to NATO and is charged with the defense of the continent's southern flank. Equipped with American material and jet planes, the Italian forces—naval, air, and land—are not at all disposed to allow Italy to go Communist.

This then is the background from which one must of necessity view the Italian scene in 1954. We find Italian sons and daughters manning the line against further Soviet westward movement. Her factories are turning out orders for U. S. and NATO deliveries, her draftees are indoctrinated on the issues of the age, and her diplomats and politicians sit in western councils in the effort to bring world peace.

This is not the picture of a nation going Communist. This is not the climate in which such a catastrophe could logically take place.

But what of the realities of the Communist menace in Italy? What of the Government's political instability? What of the Communist vote and parliamentary representation?

The situation today—a picture of three changes in governmental makeup in nine months—stands in sharp contrast to the outstanding stability of De Gasperi's six-year reign. This sudden change has shocked Americans who were likely to take for granted Italy's postwar stability. Now we have a situation roughly paralleling the periodic crises in France. Yet no one seriously reasons that France therefore is going Communist, although the Commie vote is a high and steady proportion of the total French ballots cast.

Because Italy fascinates me, I have visited it whenever possible. In 1951 I spent four months there. In 1952 and again in 1953 I had ample opportunity to renew contacts, to talk with friends and officials in government, in the foreign missions, in the Vatican, as well as with scores of average citizens. As a result I am convinced Italy is not going Communist.

Take the national elections of last spring, for example. It is now well established that the center bloc of parties led by the Christian Democrats failed to win a majority by only 55,000 votes. Under a

special electoral law a majority of 50.1 percent of the total vote would have automatically given the successful Christian Democrats 65 percent of the seats in the lower Chamber of Parliament and a clear-cut ruling majority.

Official examination of the ballots cast in the elections indicated that some one million of them were contested, spoiled or blank. Since then, a partial recount, purposely uncompleted, points the way to a clear Christian Democrat majority. However, because of a peculiar technicality in Italian election law, public announcement today of a C. D. majority based on the recount would bring about new elections for which no party is presently prepared. And Italian politicians generally agree that the slim center majority presently existing is the best tactic at the moment. This situation certainly does not reflect a nation going Communist.

Let us look more closely at the past elections. The 1948 national election showed the democratic parties obtaining about 62 percent of the vote while the Communists and their Nenni-Socialist cohorts garnered roughly 31 percent of the ballots. The remaining seven percent went largely to the parties of the right—the Neo-Fascist Movimento Sociale Italiano and the Monarchists.

In the elections of June 7, 1953, the democratic parties received just under 50 percent of the vote while the Left received 35 percent and the extremists of the Right approximately 15 percent.

A comparative breakdown indicates that while the Communists gained four per cent of the vote from 1948-53, the extreme right gained twice as much, both groups at the expense of the democratic parties. This analysis doesn't add up to an imminent and popular Communist takeover, but does warn of the increasing neo-fascist appeal.

Nevertheless, despite the determination of half the voters to return the democratic bloc in power, what accounts for the alarming percentage of votes for the extremes of left and right?

It is in this interpretation of Italian affairs that you must consider three factors before the picture becomes clear: (1) the basic attitudes of the Italian people; (2) the Catholic Church; and (3) American economic aid.

The most important of the currently accepted Italian attitudes are desire for economic security and a longing for peace; a fervent

nationalism; individualism; scepticism; religious feeling and anti-clericalism.

Let's look at these basic attitudes. The desire for economic security holds the attention of every Italian. He is fearful lest he be deprived of his next meal, and with cause. This fear tends to bring on what one Cardinal described to me as "communism of the stomach." The reasoning is simple, if naive. "I am insecure today under the 'Democristiani.' The 'Communisti' have never had a chance. If they feed me and give me a steady job, I'll vote for them."

Coupled with this economic insecurity is a longing for peace born of centuries of warfare cumulative in its effect on a lovable, laughing people.

From the ashes of a devastating World War II, Italy, with American aid of 3½ billion dollars, staged an astonishing recovery. Rebuilding, expansion, stabilization of currency (the lira is now one of Europe's firmest monies) have given the Italians reason and opportunity to be proud of their reintegration into the post-war world.

This pride has manifested itself in a developing nationalism which expresses itself in independence and resentfulness of foreign intrusions. The Communists have skillfully worked on this psychological factor and to a serious degree have succeeded in equating American aid with foreign intrusion in the minds of many Italians.

The Italian has traditionally exercised magnificent personal independence in his everyday dealings. Along with this independence—this determination to preserve and protect the interests of his family—comes an ingrained skepticism born of a history of intrigue and an ability to get along on his wits alone in the face of social and economic deprivation. Anyone who has encountered the peddlers in Naples will more than agree to this point.

Italians are basically extremely religious people. Their faith is strong and sincere. The Italian goes through life with complete trust in God, His Blessed Mother, and the Pope. His faith is real, personal, and rooted devotion. This feeling for religion can perhaps be better understood by us when we realize that the patron and favorite saint of Italy is St. Francis of Assisi, the humble, stigmatic lover of humanity who found his home with the gentlest

of birds and animals and his beloved poor. This devotion to St. Francis is symbolic of Italian character. Italy, the Sanctuary of Saints, has produced more brilliant men—St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Robert Bellarmine, St. Bonaventure—but still Francis was chosen.

The Communists understand this fact and in their propaganda they refrain from attacking this direct belief of Italians. Instead they hammer at legal technicalities and social panaceas. They play on the traditional anti-clerical feeling which pervades the land. It is this dislike of clerical involvement in politics that drives the Commie wedge between the Church and the faithful. In this light, we can undertsand their anti-clericalism, for it stems from an ignorance of the moral duties obliging every member of the hierarchy to point out the evils of life in the secular world because of its direct bearing on eternity.

However, let the Communists suggest that "Il Papa," the saintly Pius XII, is an enemy of the people and the physical safety of card-carrying members of the Party wouldn't be worth a dime!

This is the imponderable for Americans. How can you be Catholic and Communist at the same time? The answer is simple. A certain percentage of "stomach" Communist-Catholics are simply tagging along for the jobs it provides in the midst of underemployment. They are no more a Communist than I am. Secondly, the Catholic-Communist who gives lip service to religion is simply practicing Marxist morality: any means are acceptable to attain the revolution. Finally, the "Catholic" who votes Communist with serious intent is not a Catholic and he is automatically excommunicated from the communion of the faithful.

American aid, and the Italians know it even if they haven't partaken of it directly and personally, is responsible for the Italian comeback. Ambassador Luce recently stated that our assistance has brought about the creation of an estimated one million jobs, which is a tangible item for Italians to consider. Her success may be appraised by the fact that she is now the chief target of Communist attacks.

The work of our information services in Italy has been effective in telling this story. Is it not significant that several of our American Consulates in Italy have on file growing numbers of Communist Party membership cards turned in by workers who became aware of U. S. contributions to their welfare?

There are weak spots—dangerous, weak spots through which the Communists pour their lies.

The major sore point is the refusal of the industrial and landed interests to co-operate in remaking the social order. In the land where Christianity flourished, the un-Christian makeup of the economic and material spheres of life is startling. It is in this refusal to accept something more elevating than a "robber-baron" philosophy which has forced elements of the population to accept reluctantly the fancies and dreams of Communist propaganda so exploitive of the situation. The recent fall of Premier-designate Fanfani's government can in essence be traced to this difficulty. For Fanfani is an outstanding Catholic social philosopher and reformer. His position on the reorganization of society to conform to Christian principles was clearly set forth. This stand was unacceptable to the vested interests who would play into the hands of the Communists rather than part with their material power. Thus do we find unfinished programs of land redistribution, tax reform, social legislation. It is this great bottleneck, not a propensity for Communism, which so endangers our ally.

What of other factors—overpopulation, under-productivity, trade, employment, and migration? Once more we find that Italy, a relatively restricted area, cannot handle its population. Migration is restricted by prohibitive immigration laws of countries which have ample room and opportunity. In itself the birth rate of Italy is not astonishingly high for in point of fact it is lower than that of France and considerably lower than our own birth rate.

The solution, then, cannot be seen in terms of ultimate victory for Communism. Rather a sane, selfless policy which insists on equitable management-labor relations, modernization of industry, opportunities for migration and challenges at home must be the cornerstone of any stable plan for the future. The difficulty in working for this goal is simply one of getting people who are, after all, the stuff of which nations, continents, industries, and governments are made to practice the Christian virtues they preach. Until that day arrives, the Communists, so clearly aware of human frailty, will continue to hold firm.

In these terms it is difficult to conceive of Italy's basic problem being Communist. But it seems more realistic to agree with Edmund Burke that "the only thing necessary for the triumph of

evil is for good men to do nothing." Such a policy on the part of the United States of America would bring disaster to Christendom and to the world.

MAURICE S. SHEEHY

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for March, 1904, by Fr. F. P. Donnelly, S.J., is entitled "The Post-Communion." He distinguishes four parts in liturgical prayers—the address, the motive or occasion, the request and the invocation—and selects the post-communion as an illustration of the Church's prayer. He notes that in the Eastern liturgies the theme of gratitude is very prominent in the prayers after Communion, while in the Western post-communion the expression of thanks is of comparatively rare occurrence. . . . Fr. E. McSweeney, of Mount St. Mary's Seminary, gives an explanation of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union and an account of the total abstinence movement. He tells us that "no Catholic organization arises, nor is a priest connected with the movement till April 10, 1838, when a Franciscan Friar of Cork (Fr. Mathew), rising to the height of the holy founder of his order, yielded himself to the persuasion of a Quaker and took the pledge." . . . Fr. W. Stang of Providence contributes an article entitled "In Behalf of Social Reform," in which he narrates the activities of several Catholics who have contributed notably to social welfare, such as Bishop Ketteler, Cardinal Mermillod, Cardinal Manning and Pope Leo XIII. He also suggests some pastoral norms in this field for priests, such as: "Costly church edifices do not build up the kingdom of Christ. Human beings are more valuable to God than brick and mortar." . . . Fr. W. Stockley, of England, writes on "The Pope and the Reform in Church Music," urging full acceptance of the rules for church music recently promulgated by Pope Pius X. . . . A reply in the "Studies and Conferences" section asserts that there is a grave obligation on pastors to bless baptismal water both on Holy Saturday and on the vigil of Pentecost. . . . In the book review section we find a notice of the *Catholic Directory* for 1904, with the information that in the United States there are now twelve million Catholics, with thirteen thousand priests, about one-third of whom belong to religious orders.

F. J. C.

MAGISTERIUM AND JURISDICTION IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

It is axiomatic in the field of sacred theology that, wherever we find a serious controversy which appears at first sight to be something of merely academic interest, a more complete examination of the affair will show a matter of profound and highly practical importance. Such is the case, to take only one example, in the dispute about the nature of the sacramental character. Over the course of the years, various theologians have attempted to classify the sacramental character within the categories of relation and quality, and there have been writers who have tried to define this entity in terms of each of the four sub-species of quality.

From a superficial point of view, it might seem a matter of very slight moment whether the character imprinted upon the soul by three of the Church's divinely instituted sacraments is to be classified as a *relatio* or as a *qualitas,* or whether, granted that this latter classification be accurate, the character is to be correctly designated as *habitus, potentia, passibilis qualitas,* or *figura.* If ever there were a question that might appear to have significance only for those interested in the technical niceties of scientific theology, that of the classification of the sacramental character might well seem to be such a question.

Yet the correct resolution of that problem, the establishment of the fact that the sacramental character is in reality a quality of the second species, a genuine physical and instrumental potency,[1] carries with it the only accurate and satisfactory basis for an appreciation of the Church's work as the Mystical Body of Christ and of what is generally known as the theology of Catholic Action. The question which, in its technical terminology, could seem to be of little practical import turns out, on further examination, to be one of the most important in all the field of scholastic theology.

Such likewise is the case with another question, this one in the field of scholastic ecclesiology and also in the domain of public ecclesiastical law. It is a question which is debated at some length and occasionally with considerable sharpness in our theological

[1] An outstandingly competent discussion of this problem is to be found in Doronzo, *De sacramentis in genere* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1946), pp. 290-300.

literature, although, unfortunately, the manuals with which our American seminarians are most familiar do not treat it as adequately as do other textbooks. It deals with the problem of the classification or division of those powers with which Our Lord has endowed His Church.

Interestingly enough, two men from the same pontifical faculty, both Fathers of the Society of Jesus in the University of Commillas in Spain, have taken up and have brilliantly defended opposing positions in this controversy. Fr. Lawrence R. Sotillo, in his *Compendium iuris publici ecclesiastici,* defends the teaching according to which the entire power of the Church is divided into two *genera,* that of order and that of jurisdiction. He contends that *magisterium* or the teaching authority belongs or pertains to the power of jurisdiction, either as a species distinct from the *imperium* or as constituting, along with the *imperium* or ruling authority, two functions of one and the same power of jurisdiction.[2]

On the other hand, Fr. Joachim Salaverri, in his *Tractatus de ecclesia,* printed in the first volume of the well-known *Sacrae theologiae summa,* defends the position that the twofold division of ecclesiastical power is not theologically adequate and that, considering the formal and intrinsic natures of these powers, they must be considered as really and specifically divided into the powers of teaching, of sanctifying, and of ruling.[3] He holds that "the power of teaching, like the power of sanctifying, cannot be called a part of the power of true and proper jurisdiction understood in a specific manner."[4]

Fortunately the works of both Father Sotillo and Father Salaverri have gone into second editions. Both have been duly revised by their authors. Each writer has had the opportunity to inspect the arguments brought forth by the other and to publish his own replies. Both of these distinguished writers have taken advantage of these opportunities.

[2] Cf. Sotillo, *Compendium iuris publici ecclesiastici,* 2nd edition (Santander, Spain: Editorial Sal Terrae, 1951), pp. 91-99.

[3] Cf. *Sacrae theologiae summa,* 2nd edition (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1952), I, 933-52.

[4] Salaverri, *op. cit.,* p. 943. Salaverri cites Cardinal Billot's *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi,* q. 8, § 1, in support of his contention, but it is to be noted that Billot does not deny that the generic power of jurisdiction in which the teaching authority is contained is really and properly jurisdiction.

They have taken advantage of their opportunities so thoroughly, as a matter of fact, that, by the time they have finished explaining their exact positions, it is difficult to find more than the vestiges of a controversy, despite the fact that each lists the other among the opponents of his thesis. Father Salaverri holds that the power of *magisterium* is specifically distinct from the *potestas regendi.* He admits that the word "jurisdiction" can be taken in both a generic and in a specific sense, and, from the context, it seems plain that he is willing to admit that the *magisterium* is a part of the *potestas iurisdictionis,* considered in this generic sense.[5] His continual emphasis is on the term "specific."

Father Sotillo, on the other hand, while insisting that order and jurisdiction are the two *genera* into which the entire power of the Church is divided, does not choose to decide whether there is a specific difference between *magisterium* and *imperium,* or whether these two are merely different functions of the same *potestas.*[6] Hence both men seem quite justified in quoting Cardinal Franzelin in support of their own views. It was Franzelin's thesis that "Although the solemn division between the power of order and of jurisdiction is quite true and necessary, still the power of jurisdiction, which in that twofold division is taken in a generic sense, can, for the sake of greater clarity and because of mutually distinct properties within itself, be again divided into the power of rule or of jurisdiction specifically so-called and the power of *magisterium* which is authentic and which, in its fulness, is infallible. And so it is that the threefold distinction of the priesthood or the sacred ministry, the ecclesiastical rule, and the authentic *magisterium* should be considered as theologically true."[7]

Thus it is clear that in general, all of those who have taken part in this particular controversy will readily admit that both the twofold and threefold divisions of the ecclesiastical *potestas* are quite acceptable. The encyclical *Mystici Corporis* speaks of the threefold power which Our Lord conferred upon the apostles and upon their successors, "the power to teach men, to rule them, and to lead them to holiness."[8] On the other hand, the *Codex iuris canonici,*

[5] Cf. Salaverri, *op. cit.,* p. 951.

[6] Cf. Salaverri, *op. cit.,* p. 94.

[7] Franzelin, *Theses de ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Typographia polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1887), p. 46.

[8] *AAS,* XXXV (July 20, 1943), 209.

in canons 118 and 218, speaks of the twofold power of orders and jurisdiction. As Cardinal Ottaviani points out in his *Institutiones iuris publici ecclesiastici,* the original wording of canon 195 § 1 included the expression "potestas ordinis et potestas iurisdictionis ac magisterii," but the text which was actually approved and promulgated makes no mention of any such division.[9]

Despite the acceptability of both the twofold and the threefold division of the Church's power, it is much more probable that the former is scientifically preferable. In the actual constitution of the Catholic Church as this society has been established by Our Lord, the power or competence to teach actually belongs to the power of jurisdiction.

The main proof in favor of this contention is to be found in the teaching of the Vatican Council itself. In the constitution *Pastor aeternus* the Council declared explicitly that "In that same apostolic primacy in the Church universal, which the Roman Pontiff receives as the successor of Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, the supreme power of *magisterium* is also included." It likewise explains this primacy as a power of jurisdiction "quae vere episcopalis est."[10]

The entire first paragraph in the third chapter of the *Pastor aeternus* is obviously written with the understanding that the Holy Father's power of teaching is included or contained within his *potestas iurisdictionis.* This paragraph quotes the final passage from the decree for the Greeks promulgated by the Oecumenical Council of Florence. It states that "the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold the primacy (*tenere primatum*) over the entire world and the same Roman Pontiff is the successor of the Blessed Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and is the true Vicar of Christ and the head of the entire Church and the father and teacher of all Christians, and that the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal Church has been given to him in the Blessed Peter by Our Lord Jesus Christ."[11] Here the power or the competence to teach is again mentioned as part of the power to govern or to direct men in the path of eternal salvation.

[9] Cf. Ottaviani, *Institutiones iuris publici ecclesiastici,* 3rd edition (Vatican Press, 1947), pp. 210 f.

[10] *DB,* 1832, 1827.

[11] *DB,* 1826.

Now it is characteristic of the Church's power of jurisdiction that it engenders an obligation or duty on the part of those who are being directed toward holiness and eternal life through the use of this power. It is the power to bind and to loose, the power which Our Lord promised to the apostles, and which He granted to St. Peter, and to the rest through him, when He commissioned His first Vicar on earth to feed His lambs, to be a shepherd to His sheep, and to feed His sheep.[12]

It is, in other words, primarily a responsibility. The power of jurisdiction within the Church is possessed and exercised only by those to whom Our Lord has given the commission and the duty to take care of the subjects of this society. The men who have been given the apostolic power are bound in conscience to employ it, and to guide and direct the faithful in the way of eternal salvation. Those to whom the directions are issued are, on the other hand, bound in conscience to follow these directions. Thus, those who hear or heed the men to whom Our Lord has given the apostolic power of jurisdiction, by that very fact, hear and heed Our Lord Himself.

The teaching authority falls within the scope of this power of jurisdiction precisely by reason of the fact that all of the instruction given by the Church is definitely and necessarily authoritative. When the Catholic Church issues a teaching, it does not merely set forth some proposition which it sees that men should accept. It presents a doctrine which its children are bound in conscience to accept. It acts in such a way that, should the subjects of the Church refuse to accept that teaching and take it as their own belief, these people would thereby be guilty of sin against God. In its teaching, the true Church acts in such a way as to be "bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ."[13]

In defending his own contention that the *magisterium* is not a part of the power of jurisdiction in any proper or specific sense of the term, Father Salaverri has come forward with a very interesting distinction. He holds that the Church's teaching power includes the capacity to command and to pass judgment only *doctrinaliter*. According to his explanation, the *magisterium* as such demands the inward assent of the intellect and decides au-

[12] Cf. *John* 21:15-17.

[13] *II Cor.* 10:5.

thoritatively the conformity or difformity of some doctrine with the deposit of divine faith. Any command or judgment which deals with outward or external acts is represented as belonging to the power of rule or jurisdiction. Father Salaverri sees examples of the exercise of these two powers in the formula of the definition of the Immaculate Conception. The actual enunciation of the doctrine and the warning that those who presume to think otherwise "are condemned by their own judgment, have suffered shipwreck in the matter of the faith, and have failed from the unity of the Church"[14] would all fall under the heading of the power of *magisterium*. The statement that these people have incurred the penalties established by law if they should be so unfortunate as to express their denial of the defined doctrine in words or in writing would, according to Father Salaverri, fall under the heading of the power of ruling or of jurisdiction.[15]

Now this particular distinction is essential to the position taken by Father Salaverri in this controversy. Although he lists Cardinal Billot among the authorities who support his own contention on this question, his teaching is notably different from that of his great predecessor in the field of ecclesiology. It was Billot's contention that, while formally considered, ecclesiastical power is rightly divided into that of order, *magisterium,* and jurisdiction, "the power of *magisterium,* considered concretely and insofar as it has inseparably attached to it the right to command obedience of faith from its subjects, is not distinguished adequately from the power of jurisdiction."[16] Father Salaverri, on the other hand, tends to look always for evidences of specific distinction between the teaching power and the power of jurisdiction in the Church, and to overlook or at least not to stress the fact that in the concrete there is no adequate distinction between the two.

It would seem that the distinction to which Father Salaverri has had recourse in justifying his stand on this question is hardly acceptable. In the first place, it is worthy of note that he brings forth neither reason nor authority in support of his contention that the teaching power directly affects only inward acts. The one cita-

[14] *DB,* 1641.

[15] Cf. Salaverri, *op. cit.,* p. 944.

[16] Billot, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1927), p. 339.

tion to which he appeals turns out to be a statement which has nothing directly to do with the question under discussion.[17] It is simply the statement that, in the *Acta* of a Council, a prohibition or precept must be considered as distinct from the definition or the judgment about doctrine. It is quite obvious that such a distinction exists, but there is absolutely nothing to indicate that the teaching power of the Church, precisely as such, is not competent to deal directly with outwardly expressed statements about the faith.

Actually, the opposite would seem to be the case. By its very nature, the activity of teaching is directed toward the transmission of truth. It looks to the acceptance of a doctrine by the persons to whom that doctrine is addressed. But, when it is teaching done by human beings, it looks also, by its very nature, to the manifestation of that doctrine by the person to whom the teaching has been directed. A doctrine is recognized precisely as acquired or learned by reason of the fact that it is accurately expressed by the person who is being taught. It is definitely and essentially a part of the teaching process to demand and to evaluate responses to the content of the teaching.

And, in the case of the Church's *magisterium,* it is the power which is described as "bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ: And having in readiness to revenge all disobedience. . . ."[18] It is in the very act of teaching that the Church inculcates the divinely revealed truths into the minds of men, and it is also in that same act and process that it prohibits and proscribes inaccurate interpretations of the divine message.

The great good that comes from an examination of this controversy is a realization of the fact that the teaching of the Catholic Church is authoritative in a unique sense. Ultimately it is Our Lord Himself who teaches within the Church, and the doctrines set forth in His name and by His authority by His ministers demand full acceptance on the part of all the subjects of the Church. When the *ecclesia docens* acts, it inevitably binds the consciences of all Christians to accept its teachings and to manifest that acceptance. It forbids, by the very nature of its activity, any in-

[17] Salaverri refers to the author of the notes appended to the second schema of the Vatican Council's *Constitutio de ecclesia, op. cit.,* p. 945.

[18] *II Cor.* 10:5, 6.

accurate statement about the doctrine which has been proposed, or any refusal to receive that doctrine as the personal tenet of the persons to whom it is addressed. The man who rejects that teaching, rejects Our Lord Himself.

There is, of course, no other agency in all the world which is competent to teach authoritatively in this way. The authorities of the civil society are able to issue commands or laws, which the subjects of that society must obey under penalty of sin against God. They are not, however, commissioned or empowered to advance any teaching which men must accept as true and which they can reject or misinterpret only at the price of sin against God.

The jurisdiction of the state, although a genuine jurisdiction, does not carry with it or contain any power of *magisterium*. It is only when we realize that the jurisdiction which God has granted to the perfect society which is His true Church actually contains this teaching power that we can begin to appreciate the worth of the Church and the perfection of its doctrinal authority.

Ultimately, we must not allow ourselves to forget, the perfection of the Church's teaching authority is such that the Church itself does not need to add any other jurisdictional act to its authoritative condemnation of some teaching at variance with that doctrine in order to impose upon its subjects the obligation to accept that declaration with a true and inward assent, and in order to forbid, under penalty of offense against God Himself, any outward expression of opposition to what the Church has taught. The teaching power of the Church is inherently and essentially jurisdictional. The man who is subject to the authority of the Church has a duty before God of accepting the acts of the ecclesiastical *magisterium* with a sincere and genuine inward assent. He is obliged to manifest that acceptance, and to refrain from any oral or written opposition to or misinterpretation of what Our Lord, acting through the *ecclesia docens,* has proposed authoritatively for his guidance in His Church.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

BENEDICTION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

Question: I am chaplain to a small group of nuns and the problem arises about Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Just how many must be present to have this service? Also, are English hymns or hymns in the vernacular forbidden at this service?

Answer: Various authors point out that due reverence is required for the proper observance of this ceremony and this cannot be secured without a certain number of people present. However, this number has never been determined. Some have indicated that at least twelve people must be present for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. There is nothing in law that has determined exactly what number must be present and certainly nothing about the number twelve. Formerly, there was great anxiety about the number expected to be present for this service, since a public cause was required for the permission of the Bishop to conduct Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

Fr. Laurence O'Connell says that it is "mathematically impossible to determine just how many people must be present to permit the conducting of Exposition and Benediction. The Ordinary must determine how many are necessary for proper reverence." We see no great problem if the ceremony can be conducted with proper decorum and we would dislike seeing the good sisters deprived of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament because their community is too small.

The *Tantum ergo* is required music for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Approved prayers and hymns, even those in the vernacular, may be recited or sung before the singing of the *Tantum ergo.*

FUNERAL ON FEAST OF EPIPHANY

Question: I vaguely recall a special indult for funeral Masses for the United States. I had a funeral on Epiphany but did not say

the Exequial Mass because I was not sure. What about the absolution after Mass on that day?

Answer: Our inquirer was correct in saying the Mass of the day, Mass of the Epiphany, and not the funeral Mass.

According to a special indult granted to the United States, the funeral Mass may be offered on all days, except Sundays, holydays of obligation, the last three days of Holy Week and the feasts of Epiphany and Corpus Christi.

Father O'Connell informs us that on a day when the festal Mass is being sung the body must not be present or at least the candles are not to be burning beside the coffin. The absolution is a ceremony independent of the Mass but is never allowed on a double of the first class (*S.R.C.*, No. 3780).

ALTAR FRONTAL

Question: Is the *antependium* of obligation for all altars? Will a seven or eight inch or longer "fall" of the top altar cloth, either of lace or of a lace material with goldlike thread, lawfully take the place of the *antependium*?

Answer: The general rubrics of the Missal prescribe an *antependium* for every altar on which the holy sacrifice is celebrated. Msgr. Collins feels that it is the mind of the Church that the *antependium* ought to be used on the main altar of the church at least on the more solemn feasts and even on every Sunday of the year.

There are no decrees of the Congregation of Sacred Rites which demand strictly that the *antependium* be used but there is one which forbids using only a partial frontal as suggested by our inquirer. In *Sacred Furnishings of Churches* by Father Sadlowski we read: "some writers are most insistent that the frontal is of strict obligation. Liturgical tradition and the rubrics demand the use of the frontal. It is difficult to understand why so many priests . . . most punctilious about veiling the tabernacles . . . ignore the rubrics concerning the proper clothing of the altar."

Wapelhorst, O'Connell and others seem to be agreed that if the front of the altar is highly ornamented with metal or wood no

antependium is required except on the more notable feasts. However, there is no justification whatsoever for the abbreviated *antependium* of silk or particularly of lace.

VOTIVE MASSES

Question: Should the *Gloria* be recited on Saturday when the Mass, *Maria in Sabbato,* is permitted, or is that permitted only when the entire office of the day, Breviary and Mass, are of the Blessed Virgin? In a Solemn Votive Mass of Thanksgiving is there a special Mass and are special prayers prescribed?

Answer: When a votive Mass is permitted on Saturday and one chooses to say the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin, the *Gloria* is recited. This has no connection with the Breviary prayers for the day.

If permission is granted for a Solemn Votive Mass of Thanksgiving, the Mass of any Saint that may be said as a votive Mass may be selected. However, generally, the votive Mass of the Most Holy Trinity, or of the Holy Spirit, or of Our Lady is chosen. One must add to the prescribed prayers of the Mass selected, that is the oration, secret, and post-communion, the three special prayers of thanksgiving which will be found in the Missal at the end of the votive Masses, and this under one conclusion.

REASON FOR BINATION

Question: At our rectory recently when Sunday Masses were being assigned a discussion came about concerning bination. One of the priests said there were no special reasons required for a priest to binate. Please help us out.

Answer: One does not binate on Sunday for the convenience of a fellow priest. Father Augustine specifically states that the Code of Canon Law lays down the following conditions for offering more than one Holy Mass by the same priest on the same day: (a) lack of priests; (b) the convenience of the people; (c) holyday of obligation.

BLESSING OF OBJECTS

Question: One often sees priests blessing small articles (outside of medals, rosaries, etc.) such as prayerbooks and Missals, with a single sign of the cross. Is there any authority for so blessing such articles?

Answer: In *Legislation of the Sacraments in the New Code of Canon Law* we read: "Any priest can give all blessings except those reserved to the Roman Pontiff, Bishops, or to others." Blessing does not of itself imply application of Indulgence, which supposes special faculties. A priest by his power of ordination can bless articles.

The Catholic Near East Welfare Association grants certain privileges to its members and among them we find listed the blessing of certain articles with a single sign of the cross and the application of certain indulgences. Our inquirer may have observed a fellow priest with such a privilege.

A CUNCTIS IN VOTIVE MASS

Question: Is Our Lady's name omitted in the *A Cunctis* when the Mass offered is a votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin?

Answer: The *A Cunctis* does not occur as a common commemoration in a Mass of the Blessed Virgin. It may occur, however, as an *oratio imperata* or be selected as votive prayer. In such an instance the second form of the *A Cunctis* would be used since this omits any reference to Our Lady.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

SEPARATION OF SIAMESE TWINS

Question: In recent years we have read of operations performed to separate Siamese twins. What is to be said of the morality of such operations?

Answer: An operation to separate two persons physically united is surely lawful if it involves little danger to the life of either. Some

risk may be accepted because of the benefit to both consequent on their separation. Indeed, I would be inclined to hold that even if there is considerable risk, an operation may be performed because it is gravely burdensome for two persons to go through life physically bound together. This follows from the principle that a person may have an operation performed on himself, even though it involves considerable risk, if otherwise he would be condemned to great suffering the rest of his life. In the case of infants, the parents are empowered to make this decision. It must be emphasized, however, that we are concerned with a case in which there is a *good chance* for the survival of both, even though there is also real probability that one or both will die as a result of the operation.

However, if it is practically certain or most probable that one of the pair will die, even though the other will very probably be assured of a normal life, the separation of the two may not be attempted. For, in this case, the operation is the direct killing of one of the twins; and the direct killing of an innocent person is never permitted, whatever benefit may come to someone else. An example of this would seem to be the twins recently born who are separate down to the chest, but have only one body in common below that point. Thus, if one of them were severed at the chest, in such wise that the other would then possess as his own the portion of the body from the chest down, the operation would certainly be immoral, since the child thus amputated could not survive. The only solution is to provide these little ones with at least the ordinary means of surviving as long as God wills to allow them to live.

THE GRANTING OF QUARANTINES IN INDULGENCES

Question: In the recent editions of the *Raccolta* there seems to be no mention of the quarantines that used to be given in some indulgences. Has this terminology been abolished?

Answer: In some of the former grants of indulgences a certain number of quarantines (that is, periods of forty days) were added to the number of years that formed the principal concession. Thus, in the *Raccolta* of 1930 an indulgence of seven years and seven quarantines was granted for attendance at Sacred Heart devotions

in the month of June (n. 213). However, in the course of the intervening years the Holy See has ceased to use this terminology, and now grants partial indulgences in terms of days or years only. Thus, in the most recent edition of the *Raccolta* we find the particular indulgence just mentioned modified in such wise that now a person who attends public devotions in honor of the Sacred Heart in the month of June (or some other month chosen by the Ordinary for this devotion) receives an indulgence of ten years, while one who performs such devotions privately receives an indulgence of seven years (n. 253).

AUXILIARY BISHOP AS CONFESSOR

Question: Can an auxiliary bishop administer the sacrament of penance outside his own diocese to the faithful of his diocese if he has no sacramental jurisdiction in the place where he happens to be?

Answer: An auxiliary bishop as such does not possess the faculty to administer the sacrament of penance outside his diocese even to those who have a residence in his diocese, since this sacramental act requires *ordinary* sacramental jurisdiction, which the auxiliary bishop as such does not enjoy (Can. 881, § 2). However, if the auxiliary bishop is also the vicar general, he can absolve his diocesans anywhere. If he is a pastor in his own diocese he can absolve his own parishioners anywhere.

A PROBLEM ON THE EUCHARISTIC FAST

Question: If a priest is to say a Mass on Sunday at 8:30 and another Mass at 10, may he take liquids (in addition to water) immediately before the first Mass on the ground that the second Mass entitles him to such liquids up to 9 o'clock?

Answer: It is commonly accepted by those who have commented on the new privileges in the matter of the eucharistic fast that the priest who is assigned to say two Masses, one before nine o'clock, the other afterward, may make use of the right to liquid nourishment in relation to the late Mass. If this were denied him, he

would be worse off than the priest who has to say only the late Mass. However, the commentators also agree that he must take the first Mass into consideration. If one were to hold without any qualification that he can have liquid nourishment up to one hour before the beginning of the late Mass, it would follow that he could take a cup of coffee even in the course of the earlier Mass as long as it is taken an hour or more before the beginning of the later Mass. This seems to be the mind of the questioner when he asks if the liquids may be taken *immediately* before the earlier Mass. Those who have written on the subject say that any liquid (except water) taken before the earlier Mass must be consumed at least an hour before the beginning of this earlier Mass. Of course, the priest could also take liquids between the Masses if he can drink them at least one hour before beginning the later Mass. Such is the teaching of Fr. John Ford, S.J. (*The New Eucharistic Legislation* [New York: Kenedy, 1953], p. 87), and Fr. William Conway of Ireland (*The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* [Nov. 1953], 317).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE JUDICIAL POWER OF THE CHURCH

The Judicial Power of the Church falls into the category of the real jurisdiction of a juridically perfect society, for if all men are obliged by the natural and positive divine law to attain to eternal salvation as the supreme and ultimate end of all human life, they are bound to all the means necessary to acquire that end. But since the Church has been made a necessary means for salvation by the positive divine law, and since the judicial power of the Church is a necessary means by which the Church functions, the judicial power receives its obligatory force, or authority, not from the free, contractual consent of the Church's members, nor from the concession of any other society, but from positive divine law.

—The Rev. Dr. John Rohan Bourque, in *The Judicial Power of the Church* (The Catholic University of America Canon Law Studies, n. 337. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1953), p. 13.

Book Reviews

THE HOLY TRINITY BOOK OF PRAYERS. Compiled by the Right Reverend John K. Ryan, Ph.D. Illustrated by Sister Mary of the Compassion, O.P. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1953. Pp. 304. $3.00 in cloth binding.

Readers of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* are of course familiar with the works of Msgr. John K. Ryan, Professor of Philosophy of The Catholic University of America. He has made a significant contribution to devotional literature in a new prayer book artistically illustrated and printed. In the foreword, Msgr. Ryan states: "Throughout this work, prayers of outstanding merit have been presented. For this reason, the ancient sacramentaries, the eastern liturgies, the writings of the saints, and the Church's official books, especially the *Roman Missal, The Roman Breviary,* and *The Raccolta,* have been used."

Msgr. Ryan shows an excellent sense of spiritual and literary criticism in his compilation. He also is familiar with the liturgical movement, as is illustrated by his selection of prayers for preparation and thanksgiving for Communion. Prime and Compline are given also both in Latin and in English.

Very few of our prayerbooks have recognized the beauty of Eastern liturgies as does Msgr. Ryan. Also he devotes one whole section to prayers of "saints and mystics." The book gets its title from the implied emphasis on prayers to the Holy Trinity. Those who are striving earnestly to make the Marian Year a holy year will also be delighted with the selection of prayers honoring the Blessed Virgin. Msgr. Charles Spence's translation of the Stations of the Cross deserves special commendation.

A change of prayerbooks is often an indication of awakened piety. With all due regard for existing manuals of prayer, it is hard to see how anyone could fail to draw new graces from Msgr. Ryan's work. This prayerbook would be a potent spiritual weapon particularly in the hands of seminarians, religious, and priests.

The publisher has spared no effort to make *The Holy Trinity Book of Prayers* a thing of beauty.

MAURICE S. SHEEHY

PETER: DISCIPLE—APOSTLE—MARTYR. A Historical and Theological Study. By Oscar Cullman. Translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953. Pp. 252. $4.50.

The Oecumenical Council of Florence taught, and the Vatican Coun-

cil stated again, that all Christ's faithful must believe that "the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold the primacy in the entire world, and that the same Roman Pontiff is the successor of the blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and that he is the true Vicar of Christ, and the head of the entire Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that the full power to feed, to rule, and to govern the universal Church has been given to him in the blessed Peter, as it is likewise said in the records of the Oecumenical Councils and in the sacred canons." The ultimate and dominant thesis of Professor Cullman's book is a denial of that teaching.

The book is divided into two parts. The first part contains three, the second, two, chapters.

In the first part, which he calls "The Historical Question," Professor Cullman deals with the characteristics of St. Peter as a disciple, prior to Our Lord's resurrection, with his apostolic position in the primitive Church, and with the question of his martyrdom. In the second part he writes on the exegesis of *Matt.* 16: 17-19, and on the applications of that exegesis in terms of the foundation and the leadership of the Church.

It is the author's contention that St. Peter acted as the leader of the primitive Church during the earliest days in Jerusalem. He imagines that St. Peter's universal leadership ceased when he took charge of Jewish Christian missions, leaving St. James in charge of the Church in Jerusalem. The entire second section of the book is an attempt to prove, in line with this teaching, that, even if St. Peter actually came to Rome and was martyred there (which Professor Cullman considers probable), and even if, at the time of his death, he had acted as the bishop of the local Christian congregation in Rome, the Bishop of Rome would have no claim to leadership over the universal Church of Jesus Christ in his capacity as the successor of St. Peter.

Professor Cullman's procedure on this point is interesting, and clearly indicative of his basic doctrinal position. He disregards entirely the evidence supplied in any ordinary scholastic manual of ecclesiology and restates in many ways and at some length the fact that in the New Testament the name of St. Peter is never mentioned in connection with the city of Rome (cf. p. 228), and this despite the fact that elsewhere he seems to consider it probable that the "Babylon" of *I Pet.* 5: 13 is actually Rome itself (pp. 82 ff.). In other words he discountenances or at least disregards the existence of a visible and infallible Church which, as a whole and from the outset, acknowledged the universal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome and, when it came to explain the source of this prerogative, described it as the power which Our Lord had promised and had actually given to St. Peter, whose successor the Roman Bishop was and remains.

The only really interesting portion of the book, in the last analysis, is the twenty-one page section (pp. 132-52) devoted to the results of the recent excavations under St. Peter's in Rome. It reflects little credit on the vitality of our scholarship that the first book of scientific pretensions giving an account of and utilizing the data of these excavations should be a work chiefly remarkable for the fact that it has supported an erroneous theory in a somewhat original way.

Professor Cullman's treatment of the explorations is quite inadequate. "I really cannot understand," he tells us, "how anyone can speak without qualification of a 'discovered grave of Peter,' since in any case no remains of a grave survive" (p. 146). In front of the niche in the "trophy" mentioned by Gaius and easily recognizable under the papal altar of the Basilica, there is a recess about two and a half feet square, and covered with a heavy stone. Certainly this could not be a grave in which an entire body was placed immediately after death. But Professor Cullman himself, as well as the other writers who have dealt with this subject, recognizes the fact that the body of St. Peter would hardly have been turned over, after his execution, in good condition to his friends. As a matter of fact it is quite unlikely that more than a few bones of the Prince of the Apostles were ever in the possession of the Church at all.

Furthermore, in the *Liber Pontificalis* itself, the erection of a sepulchral monument to St. Peter is ascribed to Anacletus, who is here represented as the fourth successor to the Prince of the Apostles in the government of the Roman Church. Actually St. Cletus, according to the best historical scholarship, is represented in this list twice, and the Anacletus of the *Liber Pontificalis* is identical with the third Bishop of Rome. The point of the matter is, however, that the reign of St. Cletus began several years after the martyrdom of St. Peter. According to the tradition represented in the *Liber Pontificalis,* the construction of the first monument to St. Peter, marking, it must be presumed, the place where his remains were laid, came several years after his crucifixion.

Professor Cullman notes that "The report of the *Liber Pontificalis,* according to which Pope Anicletus had already erected a *Memoria* for Peter in the first century, has thus finally been proved false" (p. 145). The evidence he cites in support of that conclusion is the fact that a drain under the surface of the little area in which the Trophy is located, and the famed red wall itself, were built in the second half of the second century. It is difficult to see how any serious study could take this as a certain indication that there had been no monument or marker at all in that place during the last two decades of the first century.

What the excavators found under the *confessio* of St. Peter's is a

place on which Catholics with no particular archeological interests or skills have built and rebuilt since the third quarter of the first century. They uncovered a spot which more than once has been looted and defiled by the enemies of the faith. Obviously it is impossible for students to account fully for every stone, brick, and tile located on that spot. What has been unearthed, however, gives ample proof that "the pious Roman Catholic from the common people" did not, as Professor Cullman fancies, cherish any "illusory hope" (cf. p. 148) when he believed that the grave of St. Peter lay beneath the *confessio* of the Basilica.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

TEACHING RELIGION. By Rev. Joseph B. Collins, S.S. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1953. Pp. xiv + 422. $4.00.

The author of this work, the Rev. Joseph B. Collins, S.S., is well qualified, indeed, to write a treatise on catechetics. For six years he taught religion to children on the grade and high school levels in the Diocese of Winona. Since then he has taught religion to college students and served as ordinary professor of catechetics at the Catholic University of America. In 1941 he was named director of the National Center of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in Washington, D. C., and in that capacity has travelled throughout the country and obtained firsthand information concerning the catechetical apostolate in each diocese.

Many features recommend this scholarly volume, which is perhaps the most complete and scientific catechetical manual of our day. First of all it is comprehensive in its treatment of the subject, incorporating in its various chapters the best methods and techniques devised in the catechetical field to date. The book opens with an informative synthesis of catechetical history, covering the period from Christ to Blessed Pius X. Part II analyzes the principles and methods of teaching religion. Part III introduces us to the teacher-centered and pupil-centered techniques: the former comprise the following: story-telling, questioning, visual and audio-visual aids, drills and reviews; among the latter are numbered socialized recitation, discussion-club technique, problem-solving, projects and dramatization. Part IV focuses our attention on special catechetics, namely, First Confession, First Communion, Bible History, the Mass, sex-instruction, and the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. The book concludes with the texts of five official documents on the teaching of religion.

A special feature of the work is the introduction in Part II of the Integrated Activity Method developed at The Catholic University of America. This method incorporates the basic elements of the Munich method and is made up of six distinct steps or stages in the work of

teaching, with six corresponding steps in the acquisition of knowledge by the learner.

The volume is admirably suited for classroom purposes. Each chapter is followed by exercises, suggested assignments, and selected references. The exercises are intended to be review devices and at the same time constitute the matter for assimilation exercises. The suggested assignments point out ways in which the principles of the chapter are to be applied in catechization. The selected references are designed to aid the teacher and to indicate special readings for the student. The textual material of the book may be covered in a course of two hours weekly extending over a period of two years, or, by selective regrouping (p. 399), may be covered in a single year with one hour per week.

RUDOLPH G. BANDAS

CHRISTIANITY AND THE PROBLEM OF HISTORY. By Roger L. Shinn. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. Pp. xiv + 302. $4.50.

This is a book that is an outgrowth of our times; a book which the author wrote under the impact of the contemporary crisis as a record of his quest for a knowledge of the religious significance of the historical process. It is by no means an original theme in contemporary Protestant writing. Paul Tillich, O. Piper, H. G. Wood, O. Cullman, D. H. Dodd, Karl Lowith, and Roger Mehl—to name but a few—have discussed the problem with various shifts of emphasis. But all of the efforts seem to be based on an effort to evaluate the relation between history and eschatology.

Mr. Shinn first of all examines what might be called the epistemology of history, treating the general problems of evidence and interpretation. He then considers, in popular style, Augustinian, Thomistic, Lutheran, and Calvinistic theories pertinent to evaluation of the temporal order.

He next considers the evolution of the "Idea of Progress" as conceived in the naturalistic evolutionism of such figures as Condorcet, and then compares Marxism and Christian eschatologies. The book proceeds with a rather casual study of Toynbee, and concludes with a chapter dominated by a consideration of Providence, although no mention is made on the emphasis of this theme in Vico and Bossuet.

This is a popular book inasmuch as it attempts in a non-technical way to make a survey of the rapport between Christianity and history as conceived by Christianity's most famous figures. It is a sincere book inasmuch as it represents a studious effort to understand the meaning of the movement from various Christian perspectives. But it is an inadequate book in its almost naïve approach to the philosophy

of St. Thomas Aquinas. Mr. Shinn has indeed read the best of modern Catholic sources on these problems, such as Dawson and Gilson, and has evaluated their thought very well. But to a student of the work of the Angelic Doctor, Mr. Shinn's analysis of Thomas and the historical consequence of his thought as contained on pages 67 to 73 is little short of startling in its inaccuracy. It seems that contemporary Protestant writers are ontologically incapable of discussing medieval thought without dismissing it loftily with a few perjorative clichés. It is to be hoped that the day is not far off when these gentlemen will make a thorough study of the works of St. Thomas from primary sources. Meyer, Grabmann and Gilson are excellent writers, but none of them is a substitute for Thomas himself. The Angelic Doctor in contemporary circles remains "The Great Unread." Mr. Shinn, incidentally, makes no mention whatever of Mandonnet in citing authorities on St. Thomas.

The belief that medieval thinkers considered their society a static incarnation of the Kingdom of God is a palpable absurdity.

The book in general, however, makes interesting reading, and Mr. Shinn must be credited with a conscientious effort to understand the Christian significance of history.

ROBERT PAUL MOHAN, S.S.

THE BREVIARY EXPLAINED. By Pius Parsch. Translated by William Nayden, C.SS.R., and Carl Hoegerl, C.SS.R. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1952. Pp. 459. $6.00.

Here is a book that belongs in the hands of every priest—not impressively gracing a shelf in his library, but in his hands, a book to be used, to be studied.

The book is divided into three parts. Certain fundamental notions are treated in the first three chapters, which form Part I. First of all, the priest is reminded of his office as mouthpiece of the Mystical Body; prayer is the very life breath of that body, and it is through the priests of the world that the body does its breathing, sending up at every hour and moment of the day praises to God. Dr. Parsch then sketches briefly the history of the Breviary. In the third chapter, a brief but especially valuable one for fruitful reading of the divine office, the author brings out very well the significance of each of the canonical hours.

In Part II, the constitutent parts of the Breviary are discussed individually: psalms, lessons, orations, verses and versicles, antiphons, responsories, hymns, and the ordinary. Some readers may be impatient of the detailed treatment given in this part, if they are looking only to the practical advantages of the book, but these chapters are crowded with helpful information which will make for a more intelligent read-

ing of the *opus Dei.* Dr. Parsch is not averse to pointing out faults in our present Breviary and suggesting possible reforms, notably when he discusses the lessons.

It is the third part of the book, however, which should be of special value to the priest who has almost despaired of making his recitation of the Office a fruitful and prayerful act. Here we find treated seasonal Offices and Offices which occupy us throughout an octave: the Advent Office, the Office for Christmas and Epiphany, the pre-Lenten and Lenten Offices, the Office for Passiontide, for Holy Week, Easter, Paschaltide, and for Corpus Christi. Priests, even those confronted with the perennial problem of lack of Latin, would gain mightily if they would read the pertinent chapters as an introduction to their recitation of these Offices; they would be repaid out of all proportion to the brief time and effort required for the reading. They would undoubtedly develop not only a new attitude toward the recitation of the Breviary but also a new and enlivened appreciation of these seasons and feasts which would be inevitably communicated to their parishioners.

The concluding chapter, on "The Breviary and the Laity," discusses the possible structure of a Breviary for lay people, which would bring zealous and interested layfolk back to something of the custom which obtained before the dawn of the Middle Ages when "the laity as well as the clergy felt themselves obliged, and hence entitled, to recite the official prayers of the Church."

The translation reads well. On p. 80, read "plenteous" for "plentous"; toward the bottom of p. 143, Dom Matthew Britt's excellent work, *The Hymns of the Breviary and Missal,* is correctly cited but, near the top of the same page, it is given an incorrect title which is repeated in the Bibliography at the end of the book.

Be not deceived. The casual reading of this book will be no guarantee of the prayerful recitation of the Breviary. It will help greatly, and Part III alone should be worth the rather high price of the book in the general good effect it should have on the reader's priestly prayer. But the priest who wishes to get the most out of his entire Divine Office will have to work. Dr. Parsch's chapter on the psalms, for example, will be but a beginning. It will be up to the interested priest to tackle the whole psalter in the manner suggested by the few examples the author is able to treat. That will mean work, but should we not be ready to find some time and expend some effort to lift our recitation of the Office from the depths of meaningless drudgery to the level of real prayer? Don't reach for that Breviary just now, Father; pick up the 'phone instead and call your Catholic bookstore. They have a book that goes with that Breviary.

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.